

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 *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE DIVINE NAMES IN GENESIS.

IV. THE HEBREW TEXT.

It has already become apparent that the discussion in which we are engaged involves a conflict between two diametrically opposite points of view. Dahse, bringing to the investigation the prepossessions natural to a student of the LXX, is profoundly impressed with the instability of the textual tradition as regards the transmission of the divine names. In the LXX, fluctuation is indeed a conspicuous feature of the *apparatus criticus*; and it is perhaps true to say that in the Greek Pentateuch no element of the text is so liable to variation as the names for God. But Dahse seems to realise, more clearly than other writers of his school, that the diversity of the Greek text does not go far to prove the unreliability of the names as a whole, unless he can succeed somehow in drawing the Hebrew tradition into the vortex of confusion which exists in MSS. of the LXX. Hence he has laboured to show in the first place that the peculiarities of the Greek version are due not to accident or caprice, but to systematic alterations governed by a regard to the divisions of the Synagogue lectionary; and secondly, that its variations are based in part on different Hebrew recensions, which are entitled to quite as much consideration as the standard Massoretic recension. These positions of his have been examined at some length in the two preceding articles, where I venture to think I have shown that he is wrong all the time. If the arguments there adduced are conclusive, we might almost at this point wash our hands of the LXX altogether. It might safely be left, with its multiformity of text, in Dahse's hands to make what he can of it; and whether he discover a method in its madness or not is

henceforth of very little consequence to us. It is purely a matter of the internal condition of the Greek text, which in no degree affects the question of the stability and trustworthiness of the Hebrew tradition.

The view represented in these articles, on the contrary, is that the divine names are a remarkably stable element of the text. It is fair to admit that this impression rests in the first instance on the solidarity of the Hebrew text, although it is decidedly confirmed when we take into account the evidence of all versions other than the LXX. No one contends that the Hebrew text enjoys perfect immunity from error, or that it preserves with unflinching accuracy the names as they occurred in the original autographs of the sources of Genesis. The possibility of error in the Hebrew text must be recognised; all that is necessary for the justification of the critical use of that text as a guide to the separation of documents is evidence that the range of error is restricted within such narrow limits that it cannot seriously affect conclusions based on the assumption that the MT is correct. We shall see in another article that the versions, always excepting the LXX, differ so little from the MT as to confirm the impression that the divine names have been transmitted with peculiar fidelity. We may not be sure in regard to each particular name that it stands as it did in the primary document; but we may nevertheless find reason to believe that this must be the case in a sufficient number of instances to furnish a sound basis of induction, and to form the starting-point for a documentary theory of the Pentateuch. It will be the chief object of the remaining articles of this series to uphold the thesis that in the MT we have a recension of the divine names which possesses this character of stability in a remarkable degree, one which has undergone no material variation for more than 2,000 years, and which therefore may fairly claim to

represent, at least approximately, the names that stood in the original Genesis, or in the documents of which it was composed. The direct vindication of this position must, from the nature of the case, follow two lines of argument. We cannot hope to reach an absolute demonstration that the Hebrew text *never* varied in its transmission of the names of God, or that in the unknown earlier stages of its history it possessed the rigid uniformity which is observed in its more recent development. But (1) we can shew that the evidence adduced by Dahse and others in proof of its variability is of no value, because it ignores the fundamental canons of Massoretic criticism; and (2) we can point to facts which give a reasonable assurance that the present distribution of the divine names goes back in the main to a time not very much later than the final redaction and canonisation of the Pentateuch. In the first line of proof we are concerned with the evidence of Hebrew MSS.; in the second with the problem of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

1. HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS.

The received text of the Hebrew Bible lies before us in a considerable number of printed editions, and in some two thousand extant MSS. of the Old Testament in whole or in parts. All these exhibit substantially one and the same text. As regards the divine names of the Pentateuch, I do not know whether in the printed editions there are any variations at all. In the extant codices occasional variations do certainly occur; and it is the importance of these that we have now to consider. It is the unscholarly practice of writers like Wiener and Schlögl, unfortunately followed by Dahse, that while reproaching the higher critics for their neglect of MS. evidence, they cite MS. variants indiscriminately, without apparently having taken the least pains to inform themselves (and certainly no pains at all

to inform their readers) of the date and value of the codices in question, and without even considering the proportion of differences to agreements which are found amongst them as compared with the standard text. Now, in point of fact, there is some excuse for disregarding Hebrew MSS. entirely; but there is none for arguing as if one MS. were as good as another, or as if a single variant in one or two MSS. were enough of itself to throw doubt on the soundness of the received text. To make this clear it is necessary to explain at some length certain facts about the history of the Hebrew text which are constantly overlooked by the class of writers to whom Dahse adheres.

1. How, it may be asked, can it ever be right, or even excusable, to ignore the evidence of accessible manuscripts? A general answer to that question might be that the MSS. vary so slightly, and in such unimportant minutiae, that it is hardly worth while, except in special cases, to consult them or to investigate their differences. But that is not the main reason for assigning a relatively small importance to the variants found in codices of the Hebrew text.

(1) The leading fact is that for the last eighteen centuries at least there has existed a recognised *standard text*, which has been the norm by which the correctness of all MSS. has been judged. Of course the standard text is represented only by MSS. and (since the fifteenth century) in printed editions; but the consensus of MSS. does not constitute its sole or chief authority. Its transmission has been carefully guarded by a succession of official custodians, at first by the Sopherim or scribes, and later by those known as the Masoretes; and these authorities have sought to regulate it and maintain its purity, not merely by extreme care in the copying of MSS., but still more by the invention of the elaborate system of rules and observations which is called the *Massora* (= 'tradition'). Many of these observations go back to a

remote antiquity (some probably to pre-Christian times); most of them perhaps date from the flourishing period of the Massorettes from about the sixth to the tenth century; but the development and expansion of the system was not arrested till the introduction of printing towards the end of the fifteenth century. That the scheme was not entirely successful appears in the fact that in spite of its slight differences do occur in MSS.; that it was very nearly successful is shown by their surprising unanimity. The result is that in countless cases we know quite certainly, apart from MSS. altogether, what was the text which was deemed correct by the authoritative exponents of the Jewish textual tradition; and since extant MSS. are all of later date than the great age of the Massora, we can be sure that where any MS. violates a Massoretic injunction it goes against the best Jewish professional opinion, and is therefore presumably a clerical mistake. Now this standard text, guaranteed by the Massora, is represented with substantial fidelity, and in the case of the divine names with perfect fidelity, in all printed Hebrew Bibles; so that whatever edition the student happens to use he may feel a practical certainty that he has before him the divine names in the most authoritative form of the Hebrew text which we can now by any possibility attain.¹

¹ In illustration of the bearing of the Massora on the use of the divine names I may here instance two rules which Dahse quotes on p. 11, and which in his opinion should have prevented me from writing as I did in a brief note on the occurrences of יהוה ארני (ICC. p. 278). The first is, "In the Pentateuch and the Hagiographa the reading is always יהוה אלהים, only in 8 cases יהוה ארני" (Genesis xv. 2, 8; Dt. iii. 24, ix. 26; Ps. lxxix. 7, lxxi. 5, 26, lxxiii. 28). The other is, "In the Prophets יהוה אלהים is always to be written except in five passages, where the reading is יהוה אלהים." It is of course true that such rules tended to suppress variants in MSS.—that is what the Massora is for—and if amongst these variants there were one older than the standard recension it would be suppressed along with the rest. On the other hand it must be remembered that these regulations were not constructed by the Massorettes out of their own heads. They are based on the MSS. which seemed to the Massorettes most authoritative

(2) This standard text has existed in several forms which by courtesy are called "recensions," although their almost imperceptible divergences scarcely entitle them to that designation. First of all, nearest to our own time, we have the two divergent "recensions" of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, dating from the tenth century, the former of which is followed almost exclusively by European MSS. and in the printed editions. These, however, differ only in the vowels and accents, and agree in the consonantal text. Somewhat more important is the older rivalry between the Eastern (Babylonian) and Western (Palestinian and European) "recensions." Of the former, many MSS. have come to light during the last seventy years; but besides these we have ancient Massoretic lists of the readings in which the two differ. It is found that in the Pentateuch there are practically no consonantal variants: in Genesis, for example, the only discrepancy is in the spelling of Tubal-Kain as one word or as two (see Baer's *Genesis*, p. 81): there are of course none in the divine names. Thus from the unknown time when the Eastern and Western texts divided, there has been no authorised variation in the transmission of the names for God. In view of this astonishing uniformity, what weight can we attach to the aberrations of a few fourteenth or fifteenth century MSS. belonging to the Western "recension"? Is the presumption not overwhelmingly strong

as representing the standard text which they wished to propagate; and their object is to guard against the mistakes into which copyists were apt to fall because of the identical pronunciation of these two phrases (see below, p. 35). The selection of MSS. may not always have been judicious, or the standard text itself may be at fault; and therefore it is perfectly in order to argue (as Dahse here does—although I do not admit that he *proves*) that a different text from the Massoretic is to be preferred. But at present we are dealing simply with the evidence of Hebrew MSS.; and when it is a question between the deliberate judgment of the Massorettes on one side, and the variations of one or two MSS. on the other, there can be no doubt that the former is an infinitely better authority for the official Hebrew text than the latter.

that they are simply scribal errors, which have eluded the precautions taken by copyists, and escaped the vigilant eyes of the Massorettes ?

(3) But here a still more surprising and significant fact comes into consideration. The standard text contains stereotyped errors and defects which were recognised as such by those responsible for its maintenance ; and also eccentricities which, though not exactly errors, are purely accidental, and have no value in themselves apart from some traditional prejudice. There are words omitted which are necessary to the sense, and which were accordingly supplied in the reading ; and others inserted where they make nonsense, and omitted in reading ; words and letters marked by peculiar dots (*puncta extraordinaria*) ; letters written too large or too small, or suspended over the line ; vacant spaces in the text ; and so on.¹ Yet the scribes and Massorettes, though perfectly aware of these errors, nevertheless endeavoured to perpetuate them with the same assiduous fidelity as the essential elements of the text. How can this singular procedure be accounted for ? It is plain that the eccentric phenomena just described must have originated as accidental peculiarities of a single imperfect codex, which for some reason was regarded with such veneration that its very faults were canonised. We are thus driven to the conclusion that some one defective MS. has been adopted as an " archetype " by the authors of the standard Hebrew

¹ Thus (to take a few examples at random), in Jer. li. 3, the word for " bend " is erroneously written twice in all Hebrew Bibles, and similarly the word for " five " in Ezek. xlviii. 16 : while in Jer. xxxi. 38 the word for " are coming " after " days " has been accidentally omitted : all such irregularities were rectified in the public reading, but the text itself was never corrected. In Gen. iv. 8 the official Hebrew text has an empty space in the middle of the verse, which several of the versions fill up with the words " let us go into the field " : this clause, which seems necessary to avoid a hiatus in the sense, has apparently been dropped from the Hebrew text. On the meaning of the extraordinary points, suspended letters, etc., see the next note. !

recension, and that a persistent effort has been made to bring the whole MS. apparatus into mechanical conformity with it. Since the standard text can be traced back to the middle of the second century, it follows that the archetypal codex is at least of older date than that. Probably it was some highly venerated MS. which had survived the storm of the Roman wars and the rebellion of Bar Cochba, and was accepted on account of its antiquity as the best available norm for the sacred text at the time when the scribes were engaged in forming an official recension of the Old Testament scriptures.

From these facts many of the most distinguished of recent scholars have drawn the very plausible conclusion that all existing Hebrew MSS. have been produced by a succession of slavishly literal transcriptions from the original code which chance or necessity had elevated to the position of an archetype for the whole authorised recension.¹ Now, even if we do not accept the archetypal theory in this extreme form, it is of great importance, in view of its *partial* truth, to trace its consequences in the region of textual criticism. It is plain that, in so far as it is true, variations in existing Hebrew MSS. have arisen through mistakes in copying

¹ The following passage from Lagarde states the theory in its most complete and rigorous form : " Holding it probable, as I do, that peoples living in close contiguity, like the Greeks, Syrians and Jews of the first Christian centuries, had the same clerical usages, I am led to explain the graphic peculiarities which appear in Hebrew documents precisely as I should explain them if I encountered them in Greek or Syriac books. That is to say, I consider dotted words as deleted, letters standing over the line as inserted afterwards; from empty spaces I conclude that a hole in the parchment or defective tanning had made the skin unfit to be written on, or else that the copyist had been unable to read his exemplar . . . If now *puncta extraordinaria* and *literae suspensae* in the Hebrew text prove that the copyists had made a slip, and if the *Pesak (lacuna)* is due to some accident that had befallen the scribe or the material on which he was writing, it follows that *all MSS. which show these points, suspended letters, and empty spaces in the same places, must necessarily be slavishly accurate transcriptions of the same original.*"

directly or mediately from the archetype. It follows further that in the best event we can never gain more from a comparison of Hebrew MSS. than the readings of a single imperfect codex, to whose authority all earlier types of Hebrew text have been ruthlessly sacrificed. It is conceivable, no doubt, that a minority of MSS. may in some cases have preserved the text of the archetype, while the majority have departed from it. But as regards the divine names that consideration hardly comes into play; for here the variants are so feebly attested that it would be sheer perversity to assert their superiority to the immense preponderance of MS. authority.

For myself, however, I am free to confess that I am not so satisfied of the truth of the extreme form of the archetypal hypothesis as I was at one time. For reasons which need not here be gone into, I have come to think that, while the influence of a single archetype is undeniable, it has been brought to bear on the current text not solely by the way of slavish copying, but partly through the operation of a set of Massoretic rules taken from the archetype and applied in the writing and correcting of MSS. Hence we must allow for the *possibility* that some readings which are older than the official recension have survived as MS. variants; and it is possible that some of these have managed to slip through the ever narrowing meshes of the Massora and appear in late codices. That must be admitted as a possibility. But on the other hand, there is usually a greater probability that the variations have come in through mistakes in transcription since the establishment of the standard recension. Unfortunately, in the case of the divine names, we rarely have any criterion by which the two kinds of variants can be distinguished. Apart from the occasional support of ancient versions—a point to be considered below—there is always a presumption (considering the general stability of the transmission of the names) that a difference is due

to the error of an individual scribe. Thus in this case we are for the most part shut up to one or other of two alternatives : either we must maintain the variant of an insignificant minority of MSS. as the original reading of the standard text, or we must dismiss it as of no importance whatever. Seeing that we very seldom have more than from one to five MSS. agreeing against the majority, there can be little hesitation in deciding on the latter as the only reasonable course.

2. After this lengthy but I hope not irrelevant disquisition on the general problems of the Massoretic text, we must now condescend to particulars. And to give my opponents the benefit of every possible doubt, I will first set out *all* the Hebrew variants noted by Dahse with the assistance of Wiener and Schlögl.¹ I do not guarantee the completeness of the list—Dahse is responsible for that—but I think I can vouch for its accuracy so far as it goes.² The references enclosed in square brackets are those which, for reasons stated in the foot-notes, ought not in my opinion to be counted at all. The last column gives the versional and other support that can be cited for the variant Hebrew reading ; and as that column is not likely to be examined except by those familiar with the subject, I need not occupy space in explaining the symbols and abbreviations there employed (see Dahse, p. 52 f.) In the Hebrew columns J = יהוה, E = אלהים, A = אדני.

¹ I have supplied the variants for ch. i.

² The material is drawn from the two great collections of Kennicott (Oxford, 1776–80), and de Rossi (Parma, 1784–88). These works were produced at a time when it was hoped that important results for the textual criticism of the Old Testament might accrue from the examination of Hebrew codices. The effect of the publications was to dispel all such expectations. It was found that the variations amongst MSS. were so few and insignificant as scarcely to reward the labour of collation.

Ref.	MT.	Variant.	Heb. MS. Evidence.	Supported by
1 ^a	E	Om.	K665	
1 ^{aa}	E	Om. לַהֵם אֵל Rd. לַאֲמֹר for 'אֲמֹר לַהֵם אֵל	K650B ^a K125	LXX
1 ^{ab}	E	Om.	K2 109, 150, 650M ^a	
2 ^{1a}	JE	J	K191	
		E	K89	ec ₁ i.e. (c ₁) Eus. h
2 ^{2a}	JE	J	K69, 252	y Or-gr; etc.
2 ^{2b}	JE	J	K89	E ej vms. Luc.
3 ^{1a}	E	JE	K132	M ^{ant} rell Pal.
3 ^{2a}	JE	E	K152	Phil. Just. Chr.
3 ^{2b}	JE	J	K80	b
5 ^{2a}	E	Om. verse	K151	[? E HP 73, 74, 134 ? HP 79] ^a
		Om. אֵל אֵל אֵל	K191	Vulg. HP. 76
6 ^a	J	E	K80	D ^{ad} y ej elmort
[6 ^{1a}	E	JE ?	K152] ^a	qu ^v ec ₂ Arm. Sah. Eth. Syr.-Hex. Chr. Sam. cw. Arm. (codd.) Sam. Vulg. E.
7 ^a	J	E	K601, 686	
7 ^b	E	J	K155	
[7 ^{1a}	E	JE ?	K95] ^a	
8 ^{1a}	E	J	R266 primo	HP 19
15 ^a	AJ	JE	K95, 150, 152	
		E	K80	
		JA	K384	
15 ^b	AJ	JE	K80, 150, 384	Sah. Phil.-codd.
		J	K6, 178	f
		JA	K9, 69	
15 ^c	—	J	K69, 109	
16 ^{1a}	J	E	R669 pr.	bw OL
		[E]	R754 pr. m.] ^a	
17 ^{1a}	E	J	K189	OL
18 ^a	A	J	K155, 178, 189, 244, 387	
		JA	K9, 193	
18 ^b	A	J	K69, 89, 111, 132	
			R15, 16, 197, 251, 293, 296, 413, 419, 464, 611mg, 688, 766, 18pr., 592	
		JA	K136, 244, 686 ^a R6, 245, 467	

^a Not a MS. at all: see last article, p. 512.

^a See below, p. 39.

^a See last month's EXPOSITOR, p. 508 n. 2.

^a Wrongly cited by Dahse. The MS. substitutes אֵל אֵל for the אֵל אֵל preceding אֵל אֵל. It is an obvious slip.

^a אֵל corrected in marg. *prima manu* to אֵל אֵל: see below, p. 40.

^a Kenn, but not de Rossi, adds here K109, which has אֵל אֵל אֵל—probably an uncorrected *lapsus calami*.

Ref.	MT.	Variant.	Heb. MS. evidence.	Supported by ^{MS} _{MS}
16 st	A	J	K11, 89, 227, 239 R18, 197, 251, 592, 766	
		JA	K109	
16 th	J	Om.	K80	o
19 th	A	JA	K108	
19 th	E	J	K199	LXX
20 ^d	A	J	K9, 81, 132, 150, 152, 199, 227, 239, 601	
			R 419, 455, 507, 766, 248pr.	
		Om.	K111	
20 th	E	J	K18, 125, 159	
		JE	K109	
		Om.	K104	
22 th	J	E	K248, 601	Peah.
30 th	E	Om.	K170, 185	e n Chr.
30 th	E	J	K69, 80, 157	
31 ^d	E	J	K69 ^d	Sam.
33 th	E	J	K189	
35 th	E	Om.	K13	b
35 th	E	Om.	K13	D dhfto ₂ = (c ₂) Sah. Eth. Chr.
		EJ (1)	K5	
45 ^d	E	J	K128, 155	Georg.
45 ^d	E	J	K4, 128	

At first sight perhaps that looks an imposing list. But it will be observed that it is almost wholly made up from Kennicott's collations. Now Kennicott made it his business to register every variant in the MSS. at his disposal, whether good, bad, or [indifferent. De Rossi, who had Kennicott's work before him and used it, proceeds on the principle of recording only those readings "quae gravioris aut ullius saltem momenti mihi visae sunt, quae sensum vel mutant, vel afficiunt, et praesidium aliquod habent non modo in MSS. cod. sed etiam in Sam. textu, et in vers. antiquis." Accordingly of the above passages de Rossi considers only seven to be worthy of mention, viz., vii. 1, viii. 15, xvi. 11, xviii. 27, 31, xx. 4. And it will be seen that of the seven

^d Dahse adds "ras 229." Kenn.'s note is simply "ויצל אלהים [M T] sup ras 229," which certainly does not justify the assumption that ויפל was under the erasure! The mistake, whatever it was, must have affected the verb as well as the divine name that follows.

three are Adonay-readings, which were peculiarly liable to confusion, and which at any rate in no way affect the literary analysis.

But let us go back to the longer list. It gives 50 variants to 36 names. But of the 50, 30 are read only by a single MS. 10 by two MSS. 14 by three, and only 6 by four and upwards. Kennicott had collations of nearly 320 MSS. of Genesis in whole or in part (although little more than one-third of these had been *completely* collated). Even if we were to suppose that all the MSS. were fairly accurate, a reading supported by certainly less than 4 per cent. of all available codices is not entitled to serious consideration on MS. evidence alone.

Further, it will be noted that the only readings supported by so many as 5 MSS. are the variants to the three Adonay-passages (xviii. 27, 31, xx. 4): to these we may add the two Yahweh-Adonay readings of MT (xv. 2, 8), although the variants to these are not particularly well attested (never by more than 3 MSS.). There must be some reason for the preponderance of variants in these cases; and in the last article we have seen that the reason is the identical pronunciation of אֲדֹנָי and יְהוָה as *Adonay*, and of אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה and יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים as *Adonay Elohim*.

But, once more, it is necessary to consider the *value* of the different MSS., as tested by their general accuracy and by their age. Now of the Kennicott MSS. in the above list, de Rossi affixes a stigma to the following: K9 (thirteenth century: "mendis et rasuris scatet"), 89 (fifteenth century: "multis scatet variationibus, multisque mendis"); and of his own MSS. to the following: R15 (fourteenth century: "scriptus indiligenter"), 18 (thirteenth or fourteenth century: "sed negligentissime scriptus"), 419 (thirteenth century: "sed negligent admodum exaratus"), 669 (thirteenth century: "scatet tamen omissionibus nec

diligenter est scriptus"). K650 we have seen¹ to be simply a printed edition of the Talmud. I think that all these might fairly be ordered to stand down! On the other hand, de Rossi gives certificates of excellence to: K4 (twelfth century: "codex bonae notae"), K69 (fifteenth century: "pretiosus codex, etc."), K109 (fourteenth century: "in-signis in re critica usus"), K150 (thirteenth century ex.: "in hoc solo vel fere solo codice servantur optimae nonnullae var. lect. Samar. T. vel antiquarum vers."), K155 (thirteenth century ex.: "melioris notae codex"), K170 (thirteenth century: "codex magni pretii"), K193 (twelfth century: "optim. et antiquus cod."), K248 (thirteenth century: "bonae notae"), K686 (thirteenth century. in.: "opt. cod. ac sing. . ."), R197 (fourteenth century: "diligentissime scriptus"), R592 (thirteenth century: "singularis in re critica usus. . ."), R469 (fifteenth century: "accuratus, nitidus"), R507 (thirteenth century: sat diligenter con-scriptus"). On the great majority he makes no comment; and we are left to estimate their importance from their probable date. De Rossi (p. xv.) lays down the maxim that for a Hebrew codex to be accounted in any sense old it ought at latest to be of the end of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century. It might be interesting to see how matters would stand if we adopt it as a working rule to strike out of our list (1) all MSS. of whatever age against which De Rossi has placed a bad mark, and (2) all MSS. later than the beginning of the fourteenth century, unless specially certified as good. This would leave the panel of acceptable MSS. somewhat as follows: K4, 69, 80, 109, 150, 155, 157, 170, 185, 191, 193, 199, 227, 229, 239, 248, 252, 384, 601, 686: R16, 197, 245, 248, 251, 266, 296, 412, 464, 507, 592, 754, 766. If any reader should be at the trouble to revise the list of variants on these lines, he would find that it shrinks

¹ *Expositor*, June, p. 512.

to about two-thirds of its former dimensions ; that if we take out omissions and the Adonay-passages (where the literary analysis cannot be affected) there remain but 16 confusions of J, E and JE ; that of these 11¹ are supported only by one MSS., and only one (xxx. 23) by so many as three. What the proportion of chaff to wheat might be in this sifted list we need not try to guess ; but I can hardly believe that the most aggressive "textual" critic would claim the result as a signal refutation of the pretensions of the documentary theory. When we take into account the general considerations set forth in the preceding pages, we shall hardly be disposed to assign any weight whatever to the indiscriminate citation of variants in Hebrew MSS. in which the "textual" critics are wont to indulge.

3. But in justice to my opponents I must now go on to note that they rely not so much on the unsupported evidence of Hebrew MSS. as on the *agreements* of many of their variants with readings found in one or more of the ancient versions. This, they think, is a very strong proof that the readings in question are derived from a Hebrew original independent of the MT. Now in so far as the Samaritan Pentateuch and versions other than the LXX are concerned, the matter will be considered in the next article ; and it is enough for the present to point out that corroborations from these quarters are very rare, (Sam. 3, Pesh. 1, Vulg. 2) and do not all told amount to a serious challenge to the soundness of the Massoretic text.

But in respect of the LXX, with its plethora of variants, the case is naturally different. If, indeed, we take only those readings which are supported by the bulk of LXX authority, we find that there are only two or at most three cases to consider (i. 28b, xix. 29a, iii. 22 ?)—a negligible quantity.

¹ ii. 18, iii. 23, vi. 5, vii. 9, viii. 15, xix. 29a, xx. 11 (bis), xxxi. 9, xlv. 5, xlv. 7.

It is of course admitted that in these cases it is a question whether the LXX, backed by Hebrew MSS., may not have the original text; but they are so few that even if in each case the MT should happen to be wrong its general authority as against isolated MS. divergences would not be impugned. But if we are to reckon up all the instances where a Hebrew variant has *some* support from LXX MSS. or daughter-versions or citations, no doubt the number is considerable. I have noted in the last column of the table the LXX evidence for the various readings,—not very carefully, but mostly trusting to the statistics furnished by Dahse. It will be seen that 24 Hebrew variants agree with some form of LXX text. But here the so-called “textual” critics seem to blunder egregiously. They argue that even a solitary Greek MS. acquires importance, as indicating an original Hebrew text, if it be in agreement with a single Hebrew MS.; and of course *a fortiori* if there be two or three on either side. To reason thus is to perpetrate a gross mathematical fallacy. The doctrine of probabilities comes into play. Our opponents overlook the fact that the limits of possible error are extremely narrow, while the chances that an accidental error in a Hebrew MS. will coincide with a reading in the apparatus of the LXX are remarkably good. That is to say, if a Hebrew scribe went astray from the MT in copying a divine name, he could only substitute E for J or J for E (in rare cases a JE might afford a wider choice of error); and in either event he would be pretty sure to find his mistake “confirmed” by some MS. of the LXX. I calculate roughly that in about two-fifths of the names contained in Dahse’s tables *both* the alternative readings occur in LXX MSS. or daughter-versions, or citations; so that if a Hebrew MS. differs from the MT it has two good chances in five of finding some kind of support in the LXX. In all but two (i. 28, xviii. 15) of the 24 actual instances of agreement between Hebrew and Greek MSS.

the Massoretic reading is also represented in the LXX, and in the vast majority of cases far more strongly attested than the variant. In these circumstances it is mere pretence to speak of coincidence as corroboration, or to argue that a variant derives importance from the fact of its occurring in two unrelated series of documents. We can now measure the importance of Dahse's assertion (p. 51), "Die Varianten der LXX werden geschützt (a) durch hebr. MSS."¹

4. Lastly, it is alleged by textual critics that there are passages where the MT is *on internal grounds* "demonstrably" wrong in its use of the divine names, and where the true reading has been preserved in a small minority of Hebrew or Greek MSS. I reply that I do not believe any such case exists, and that certainly none of those that have been adduced will be found on examination to bear out the contention.

¹ I would here call attention to v. 22, which sheds a lurid light on the value of Hebrew "corroborations," and also on the incredible perfunctoriness with which such variants are cited by writers like Wiener and Dahse. (See the list, p. 34 above). The facts are these: (1) K151 omits the entire verse: I presume that Dahse will not defend *that* text. But his statement that "K151 stimmt mit E" is wholly erroneous. E (a Greek uncial) simply substitutes *καὶ εἶησεν Ἐνώχ μετὰ κτλ.* for *εὐηρεστήσεν δε Ἐνώχ τῷ θεῷ μετὰ κτλ.*, in conformity with the stereotyped formula used throughout the chapter. If Dahse should maintain that this is the original text, I should not object; but that is neither here nor there: it is *not* the text of K151. (2) The Greek cursives HP 73, 74, 134 (= t) read practically as E (*εἶησε δε*), and to cite them (as Dahse does) as simply omitting *τῷ θεῷ* is thoroughly inaccurate and misleading. (3) K191 omits *וַיִּתְּחַלֵּךְ אַחֲרָיו*, yielding the impossible sentence, "And Enoch walked after he begat, etc." The only LXX MS. that *appears* to confirm this nonsensical reading is HP 79, which has *εὐηρεστήσεν δε Ἐνώχ μετὰ κτλ.*, "And Enoch pleased after he begat, etc," which is just as absurd as the text of K191. But (a) it is to be observed that *εὐηρεστήσεν δε* corresponds not to the bare *וַיִּתְּחַלֵּךְ* but to *וַיִּתְּחַלֵּךְ אַחֲרָיו*, so that it does not agree with K191. (b) The agreement is not merely superficial, but clearly accidental. At least it is presumable that the peculiar reading of 79 was brought about by a secondary correction of the *καὶ εἶησεν* of E to the *εὐηρεστήσεν δε* of the ordinary LXX, the copyist not perceiving that he was making nonsense of the verse by overlooking the *τῷ θεῷ* which followed. Many MSS. exhibit conflation of the two readings.

The passage most persistently cited in this connexion is Genesis xvi. 11. From the time of de Rossi at all events it has passed from hand to hand as a palpable proof that the MT cannot have preserved the original name. Dahse, supporting Wiener's philippic against the present writer, says (p. 32): "mit Recht . . . macht Wiener mit allem Nachdruck geltend, dass nicht bloss, wie Skinner as tue, die 49 Fälle der Abweichungen, die Redpath und Eerdmans nach Swete anführen, zu berücksichtigen seien, sondern auch zahlreiche (?) andere Stellen, wie z.B. Genesis 16/11, wo die Handschriften bw (mit OL, arabs uterque, und hebr. MS.) *offensichtlich* mit ihrem *o theos* das Richtige böten." Let us then consider the import of xvi. 11. It gives an etymology of the name Yishma'el (יִשְׁמָעֵאל) = 'may *El* hear' in the words "for *Yahweh* has heard, etc." (כִּי שָׁמַע (יְהוָה וּגְנִי)). This, we are told, is a glaring and impossible contradiction. Wiener, with characteristic presumption, says that the name Yishma'el *must* have been explained by a sentence containing *Elohim*, for if the explanation had contained the name *Yahweh* the name *must* have been Yishma'yah! He seems to imagine that Ishmael is a fictitious name, whose form could be changed according to the taste and fancy of the speller. In reality it is the historic name of a tribe which no writer could alter from merely literary motives. That is a confusion of ideas which is extraordinary even in a mind untrained to exact philological thinking; and I have not observed that any other writer has put the matter quite so crudely. But they all alike labour under the illusion that *El* and *Elohim* are convertible terms. It is a wonder that none of them have thought of taking up a hint of the cautious de Rossi, who, after defending *Elohim* as "conformior" to the name Ishmael, says "huic affinis ac congruentior est lectio cod. mei 754 ex prima manu כִּי שָׁמַע וְגַם יִשְׁמָעֵאל עִינֵיךָ"; although he adds "Sed Jeoah ipsa, ut videtur, primi

scriptoris manu ad marginem restitutum est." We must suppose that there was a time when the interpretation of such a name as Ishmael would have been expressed in a sentence like "El hears"; and the courage of our textual critics might well have proved equal to the advocacy of the claim of R754 to be the sole representative of that primitive etymology. However, they have not done so; and we have simply to insist, against their contention, that El is no more Elohim than it is Yahweh. It is an archaic name for the Deity which had ceased to form part of the ordinary spoken language¹ before these narratives were reduced to writing, and which had to be replaced by one of the two names for God current in common speech. There is absolutely no reason except usage why one of them should be used in preference to the other. If a writer habitually [used Yahweh he would naturally say כִּי שָׁמַע יְהוָה; just as readily as another who habitually used Elohim would write כִּי שָׁמַע אֱלֹהִים. The latter phrase actually appears in the parallel passage xxi. 17, where the Elohist is giving *his* etymology of the name Ishmael. So that instead of xvi. 11 weakening the evidence for the documentary theory, it furnishes in reality one of its most striking detailed confirmations.²

The case is on all fours with the explanation of the name Samuel (שְׁמוּאֵל) in 1 Sam. i. 20, where the MT has כִּי מִיְהוָה שְׁאַלְתִּי: "for from *Yahweh* I asked him." This reading is supported by all Hebrew MSS., by the Peshitta, the Vulgate,

¹ For details, see Driver, *Genesis*, p. 403.

² And because I knew all this before Wiener was ever heard of, and did not think fit to waste words in exposing his transparent incompetence, I have been denounced by him as a liar and impostor, engaged in a deliberate attempt to deceive the public! And further, because I have not sued him for libel in a court of law, he has the assurance to boast that his point is proved! Such are the controversial methods of this "English jurist," for whose accomplishments Dahse has conceived so strange an admiration. Perhaps he has heard of a Lord Chancellor of England who was supposed to know "a little of everything—even of law."

and even the LXX. For although a good many MSS. vary from the chief printed editions (Swete, after A, B: *παρα Κυριου θεου σαβαωθ*), there is not one which omits the *κυριου*.¹ Will the "textual" critics maintain, in the teeth of all textual evidence, that Yahweh is there an impossible reading, and must have been substituted for Elohim? If not, their argument in the parallel instance of Ishmael completely breaks down. And if they do, they so stultify their own method that we need no longer give heed to their opinion. At all events, I hope we shall hear no more of Genesis xvi. 11 as an instance where the MT is "demonstrably" wrong.

A very similar, but even weaker, instance cited by Dahse is the etymology of Reuben in xxix. 32 (p. 44). He says it is "allbekannt" that the name was originally *Rubel*; whence it follows that Yahweh in xxix. 32 ("Yahweh has seen my affliction") cannot be original. Well, one would like to hear what *was* original there. Dahse does not even tell us how he understands the name רֵאוּבֵל: he rather gives the impression that he holds the utterly impossible view that it is a compound of רֵאוּב and אֵל. I will assume, however, that he takes its second component to be בַּל = בעל (Baal), used as a generic title of the Deity; and that its signification is "seen of Baal" (see *ICC*. p. 386). Supposing that to be the correct name, and the etymology intended, we must again assume that in early times the interpretation was expressed in that form, like the explanation of "Jerubbaal" in Jud. vi. 32. Now when Baal ceased to be used as an epithet of the national God and was appropriated to a strange deity, the name could be retained in Jud. vi. 32,

¹ The principal variants are the following: *Κυριου σαβαωθ* (9 MSS.); *Κυριου σαβ. πατροκρατορος* (4 MSS.); *Κυριου σαβ. θεου πατρ.* (3 MSS.); *Κυριου Κυριου σαβ. πατρ.* (1 MS.); *Κυριου* alone (1 MS.). *Κυριου πατρ.* (Complutensian Polyglott).—*πατροκρατωρ* the usual rendering in the LXX of צְבָאוֹת (= *σαβαωθ*), "Hosts."

because it implied in that connexion no recognition of the false god. But in Genesis xxix. 32 its retention would have attributed heathenish worship to the patriarchal family, and it was necessary to replace it either by Yahweh or by Elohim. And when it was exchanged for a name of the true God, it was just as legitimate and natural to replace it by Yahweh as by Elohim. There is therefore not the slightest *internal* ground for questioning the correctness of the Massoretic reading.

Amongst the passages where Dahse tries to shew that the Yahweh of the MT cannot possibly be right for internal reasons, there are two which he thinks are proved to have been originally Elohim-passages by independent tradition or by allusions in Hebrew literature. The first is the account of Jacob's wrestling at Peniel (Gen. xxxii. 24 ff.). This, he says, is known to be attributed to J. That is not quite so. It has also been attributed to E; and the drift of recent criticism has been to regard it as a composite narrative in which J and E have been amalgamated (see *ICC.*, p. 407). But however that may be, it is certain that the only divine name which occurs in the MT is Elohim (*vv.* 29, 31). What then is the sense of citing Hos. xii. 4 (with Elohim) and arguing that if Hosea had read it in a Yahwistic book he would certainly not have used Elohim here? We do not even know that Hosea read it in any book; if he did, there is no reason why it should not have been an Elohistic book; *but* even if his written source was our present Yahwistic document, he would surely use the divine name which occurs in that document, which, as we have seen, is Elohim. The argument thus turns round into a singular confirmation of the scrupulous accuracy of the tradition of the divine names in the Hebrew text. And Dahse might at least have mentioned that the critics who assign the passage to J are guided by something else than a slavish regard to the divine names of

the MT. The second example is the story of the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen. xix. (cf. xiii. 10). According to the MT this is a Yahwistic passage, and is therefore assigned by critics to J. But in three prophetic passages (Am. iv. 11, Isa. xiii. 19, Jer. l. 40) it is referred to as a destruction wrought by *Elohim*. Now, to begin with, the force of these three passages is neutralised by Deut. xxix. 33 and Ezek. xvi. 48 ff, where Yahweh is used. But the root of Dahse's error lies deeper. "If there was a version of the story which favoured a particular designation of the Deity . . . it must have been an Elohist narrative, and not the Yahwistic which we now find in the MT" (p. 42). No one denies that the oldest version of the story may have been Elohist: indeed the whole point of the contention that it was so is that it was a foreign myth imported into Israel, in which the name Yahwe could not possibly have been used. But that is not the question that Dahse has to face. The question is not of how the narrative read in its primitive form, but of the literary shape into which it was cast by the author of the account we have in Genesis. If for the true God who was the author of the catastrophe, that writer habitually used the name Yahweh, why should he not do so in this instance as in every other? As for the prophetic allusions, Amos lived at a time when the primitive form of the myth may well have been a living memory, and there is no reason to suppose that he had no authority other than our present Yahwistic document. And if late prophets like the authors of Isa. xiii. 19 and Jer. l. 40 still continued to use *Elohim* in connexion with this incident, that does not mean that they read *Elohim* in the Genesis narrative. It is much more probable—it is, indeed, all but certain—that they had in their minds the unusual phrase of Amos,¹ which

¹ כַּמִּהַפְכַת אֱלֹהִים אֶת סָדֹם וְאֶת גֹּמֹרָה, where the אֶת shews that the noun סָדֹם has the force of an infinitive.

they reproduce *verbatim et literatim*. Again the Massoretic reading in Genesis comes unscathed out of the text-critical ordeal; and the occasional Elohims of the LXX have no greater probability than they acquire from purely textual evidence (here sufficiently slender), as in all other cases.

JOHN SKINNER.

THE FORMS OF HEBREW POETRY.

II. PARALLELISM : A RE-STATEMENT—*continued*.

I PASS NOW by a different method to a more detailed examination of parallel lines, and of the degree and character of the correspondence between them. Irrespective of particles a line or section to which another line or section approximately corresponds, consists of two, three, four, five or six words, very seldom of more. *Complete parallelism* may be said to exist when every single term in one line is parallel to a term in the other, or when at least every term or group of terms in one line is paralleled by a corresponding term or group of terms in the other. *Incomplete parallelism* exists when only some of the terms in each of two corresponding lines are parallel to one another, while the remaining terms express something which is stated once only in the two lines. Incomplete parallelism is far more frequent than complete parallelism. Both complete parallelism and incomplete parallelism admit of many varieties; and this great variety and elasticity of parallelism may perhaps best be studied by means of symbols, even though it is difficult to reduce all the phenomena to rigidly constant and unambiguous symbolic formulæ. I have already elsewhere¹ suggested that the varieties of parallelism may be conveniently described by denoting

¹ *Isaiah* ("International Critical Comm."), p. lxxvi.