

ARTICLE IX.

CRITICAL NOTES.

THE POST-MOSAICA OF GENESIS.

THE application of textual criticism reduces the post-Mosaica of Genesis to a negligible quantity. We have seen that the Septuagintal evidence removes Genesis xxii. from the category of passages that could have been written only after the time of Moses.¹ Two of the other best-known passages are treated by Dr. Carpenter as the additions of glossators—in my opinion rightly. These are xii. 6b (“And the Canaanite was then in the land”) and xiii. 7b (“And the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land”). In these passages “then” if interpreted to mean “then still” cannot be earlier than the time of Solomon; and this seems the more plausible interpretation. Another passage that should probably be regarded as a commentator’s addition is xxxvi. 31–39. Dr. Carpenter’s note on the first of these verses is as follows: “With this verse R introduces an extract 32–39 from a document wholly different in style from the context. Its source is unknown, but on the analogy of other passages of composite origin, e.g. x, it is provisionally assigned to J.”

With the exception of a single word the other texts on which the critics rely to prove the late date of Genesis all fail to do so when carefully examined. It is said that the use of the “sea” to denote the West points to a narrator who lived in Palestine. Thus we read in xii. 8, “having Bethel on the *sea* side”; xiii. 14, “northward and southward and eastward and seaward.” The conclusion most certainly does not follow from the premise, for a narrator could easily picture to himself the geographical situation of Palestine, wherever he might

¹ *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1910, pp. 351 ff.

himself be living; but in point of fact the linguistic usage of "seaward" for "westward" is more probably to be explained by the incorporation in Genesis of stories that had come down from the patriarchal times with their language unchanged. A very strong instance of this occurs in x. 19: "As thou goest toward Sodom and Gomorrah and Admah and Zebaiim," — a phrase that could not have originated after the destruction of the places named in Abraham's time. In the face of such a passage as this no argument for late date can be drawn from the usage of the word "sea"; but a presumption of very early date arises.

As König points out, the name "Hebron" in Genesis does not prove post-Mosaic origin; because, though Joshua xiv. 15 states that "the name of Hebron beforetime was Kiriath-arba," we have no knowledge as to when the change of name was made. The narrative does not suggest that Caleb was responsible for the change. On the contrary, in the preceding verses the place is called Hebron, as would be done if it had already borne that name when the gift was made. Hence this antiquarian note does nothing to prove the post-Mosaic date of passages in the Pentateuch.

More important is the argument based on the phrase "the land of the Hebrews" in xl. 15. This is supposed to be an anachronism, on the ground that Canaan could not have been called the land of the Hebrews before the conquest.

The ordinary Septuagintal text here has a very remarkable variation. It reads "land of Hebrews." The unusual omission of the definite article cannot be due to chance; for "land of Hebrews" is neither Greek nor Hebrew for "land of *the* Hebrews." It appears therefore that the original text must have contained some place name instead of the word "Hebrews." Only two variants are recorded in the larger Cambridge LXX: one of these is "of Egypt," the other "of a Hebrew." Neither of these makes sense: but both confirm the inference that must be drawn from the absence of the article. They appear to go back to a text in which some singular word stood. We are therefore definitely able to say

that there is corruption in this passage, but with our present materials we cannot restore the original text.

Most of the other alleged post-Mosaica appear to be generally abandoned by the critics. Since the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, "Salem" in xiv. 18 no longer ranks as an anachronism. It was once claimed that the "tower of Eder" in xxxv. 21 pointed to late date (cp. Micah iv. 8; Neh. iii. 1), but nothing is now heard of this curious contention. Dr. Driver holds that "in Israel" (xxxiv. 7) is inconsistent with Mosaic authorship, but is so palpably in error that his fellow-critics do not generally advance this argument. *If* the gloss in 1 Samuel ix. 9 is in all respects accurate, and *if* the word "prophet" in Genesis xx. 7 is used in precisely the same meaning as under the monarchy, then no doubt a case may be made against this word; but the postulates place considerable strain on men's faith.

There is, however, one word in Genesis against which a good case can be made — the name "Dan" in xiv. 14. This would naturally be identified with the later Dan, for the hypothesis that there might be another place of this name possesses little probability. The only variants recorded in the larger Cambridge Septuagint — "Dam" and "Dathan" — appear to be due to Greek corruptions. The word may be a gloss, as Dr. Orr thinks: it may, however, equally well be a corruption of some other word. In any case it would show a lamentable lack of proportion to argue for a late date for Genesis as a whole on the ground of this single word.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

THE EGYPTIAN NAME OF JOSEPH.

SPEAKING of the age of Solomon, Dr. Carpenter writes: "To this age, likewise, does Brugsch on contemporary monumental grounds assign the origin of such names as Zaphenath-paneah and Poti-phaera Gen. xli. 45, while Lagarde believes them to be still later, ascribing them to the time of Psammetichus I and Necho, 663-595 B. C."¹ Similarly Professor Barton has

¹ Oxford Hexateuch, vol. 1. p. 107.

recently written: "Brugsch and Steindorf had pointed out years ago that the Egyptian names which occur in Genesis, such as Potiphar and Zaphenathpaneah, are not found in Egyptian earlier than XXII dynasty, or the tenth century B. C. Professor W. Max Müller informs me that Egyptological research during the last twenty years confirms this statement."¹ It is therefore well to point out that Egyptologists are by no means agreed on this point. In any case it would be a mere argument from silence, but Professor Naville, the distinguished excavator of Pithom, has recently argued strongly against the view set out above.

His paper "The Egyptian Name of Joseph" will be found on pages 203-210 of the "Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology" for June, 1910. Here I can give only some of the less technical points.

It appears that there are at least three rival explanations of Joseph's name in the field. Professor Naville himself thinks it should be translated "the head" or "the master of the school of learning," or of "the Sacred College." Professors Spiegelberg and Steindorff make it "the god speaks and he [the newborn] lives"; Professor Mahler, "the feeder of the land, who gives life." This in itself should be enough to give those who are not Egyptologists pause. Professor Naville states some of his less technical arguments as follows, and I think that every reader must be impressed by them:—

"It seems to me that the fault of Prof. Spiegelberg's translation is that it is based on a wrong principle, viz., that transcriptions from one language to another are made according to rules fixed by philology. In this respect I believe that the ancients did not differ from us, and that difficulties which occur to us in relation to the past may often be solved by comparison with the procedure of the present day.

"Let us think of what happens for instance, when a French or English name is written in Arabic by an Arab writer; or let us look at the way the names of Egyptian railway stations or telegraph offices are spelt when they are written in Roman characters. The spelling will be quite different according as it comes from a man

¹ *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xxviii. (1909) p. 153.

whose native language is French or English. We never find that a word passing from a language to another is transcribed according to definite rules, because nearly always the transcription is regulated by the ear, by conformity of sound. A man hearing a foreign word reproduces it in the best way he can, by the letters which have the nearest sound. If a foreign letter, or a foreign sound, does not exist in his language he will approximate as much as he can; but instinctively he will always introduce in the foreign word, sounds and especially syllables which are familiar to him.

"Another element which governs a great number of transcriptions is what is called popular etymology, the tendency to find in a foreign word a sense which often has nothing to do with the original meaning. It would be easy to adduce hundreds of examples of these two facts, from modern languages. I shall quote only a few. The Yeomen of the Guard at the Tower of London have certainly been called *beefeaters*, as soon as their French name *buffetiers*, which has a totally different meaning, was introduced into England. The old French word *oyez*, which means, 'hear, listen,' does not sound like an English word, and has no sense in English. Therefore it is commonly pronounced and sometimes spelt *o yes*. In the same way I have found the name of *Belvoir Castle* written *Beaver Castle* which would mean in French: 'le Château du Castor'; and certainly if the French name of *Beauchamp* had to be written according to the way it is pronounced in England it would be spelt *Beecham*. . . .

"I interpret the names of Potiphar, Potiphara, Asenath, in a totally different way from Prof. Steindorff. Poti-phera I consider as being *P. hotep Ra* which is with the article *p* the name of the high-priest of On whose beautiful statue has been found at Meldoom and which belongs to the IIIrd or IVth dynasty. Potiphar would be likewise *P. hotep Har*, and Asenath the name¹ *Senit* of the XIth dynasty with the prosthetic *a* very common with the Semites and very likely to be found in a Semitic transcription. But I shall dwell chiefly on the name of Joseph.

"It is clear that if the interpretation 'the god speaks and he lives' is rejected the argument of Prof. Spiegelberg falls to the ground."

After explaining the way in which the critics divide this passage between two authors (J and E), Professor Naville argues against this view at length. The following extracts are of considerable importance:—

¹ I here omit a hieroglyphic [H. M. W.].

"All Egyptologists agree that the history of Joseph has a genuine Egyptian colour, and as Ebers says, it agrees exactly with the local circumstances. Now if we remember that the two authors belong to two different kingdoms, and probably to different times, the similarity of their narratives obliges us to conclude that they both worked on an older document, not merely on traditions which had been preserved for something like 700 years, but on some written text. . . .

"Unless the whole narrative is a romance of which he was the author, why should the Elohist put in it names of his own time? It would be just the reverse of what the critics maintain in other cases. For instance they do not admit that in the rubrics of the Book of the Dead the names of kings of the Old Empire are historical. They have been inserted at a late epoch to make the text more venerable. Here it would be just the contrary. That the author, when relating events which took place several centuries earlier, should put in names of his time would be a rather extraordinary way of writing history! . . .

"Here again, studying this part of Genesis from outside, from Egypt, we arrive at conclusions very different from those of the majority of the critics. It seems to me that the presence in the book of names such as Zaphenath Paneah and others, and the thoroughly Egyptian narratives of the life of Joseph and the Exodus, point to the existence of an early document written in Egypt by a Semitic writer, when the traditions as to the earlier facts were fully alive, and at no great distance from the later ones."

H. M. W.

THE HIGH PRIEST.

THE paper on "Priests and Levites"¹ grew so long that it was impossible to include many remarks on the high priest; yet one or two observations fall to be made respecting Wellhausen's theory on this point. Most of his discussion consists simply in putting indubitable facts from his own peculiar point of view. Thus it is certainly the case that in 1 Samuel ii. 36 the principal priest appoints some of his inferiors: but this really tells against Wellhausen. The Priestly Code knows no priestly offices with salaries attached and points to a much simpler organization. Aaron's sons act under his oversight (Num. iii. 4), as Wellhausen urges on page 149 of his Prolegomena;

¹ *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1910, pp. 486-539.

but that is true of the inferior priests from the earliest times. Eli's sons proved too insubordinate for their weak and aged father, yet the latter was held responsible by the prophet—obviously because it was his duty to control them. The whole of Wellhausen's reasoning about the king is worthless unless the Priestly Code can be demonstrated to be post-Mosaic. In the discussion of "Priests and Levites" it was shown to be untrue that "the so-called Mosaic theocracy . . . is, so to speak, a perfect fit for post-exilic Judaism and had its actuality only there"¹ and this is proved still more fully in my article above, "Some Aspects of the Conservative Task in Pentateuchal Criticism." As a whole the question of the high priest has very little decisive force one way or another, because in dealing with it Wellhausen has not produced a single cogent argument. His discussion is noteworthy only for its special coloring, yet there is one point that calls for notice. On page 150, he writes: "His death makes an epoch; it is when the high priest—not the king—dies that the fugitive slayer obtains his amnesty (Num. xxxv. 28)." In point of fact this very law—that of Numbers xxxv.—was singled out by Dareste as the most archaic portion of the legislation. I reproduce here his remarks, together with some comments of my own from page 24 of my "Notes on Hebrew Religion":—

"Nous n'avons pas à examiner ici à quelle époque a été écrit le Pentateuque. Ce qu'on peut affirmer, c'est que les institutions dont il nous donne le tableau sont très anciennes, contemporaines de l'établissement d'un pouvoir central. On en trouve d'analogues chez tous les peuples, au moment où ils ont cessé d'être un assemblage de familles pour devenir une nation et former d'être un assemblage de familles pour devenir une nation et former un État. Ce n'est pas non plus une législation idéale, une utopie rétrospective. Il n'y a pas une des lois mosaïques qui n'ait été réellement pratiquée chez des peuples autres que les Hébreux. La plus archaïque de ces lois est celle que nous lisons dans le chapitre xxxv. du livre des *Nombres*" (*Études d'histoire du Droit*, p. 28, n.). The last two sentences appear to me to need some qualification—e.g., it might reasonably be contended that some other portions of the legislation are as archaic (as distinguished from an-

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 151.

cient) as Num. xxxv. (I would remark parenthetically, that on p. 22 Dareste had devoted special attention to this chapter and its parallels in Greek and Icelandic law.) Indeed, I gather from pp. 23, 24, that Dareste would say the same of Deut. xxi. 1-9. But the soundness of his general position could not be questioned by any student of comparative jurisprudence who examined the Mosaic legislation with an unprejudiced mind.

The true explanation of the position of the high priest is quite different from that supposed by Wellhausen. This law is merely a generalization and amplification of the personal experiences of Moses the manslayer¹ and the high priest takes the place of Pharaoh because he was the only permanent hereditary official created by the law.

Wellhausen's idea of the high priest is really closely bound up with his view that P represents the Israelites as a church. In another place he writes: "Now the smaller sacred fellowships get lost, the varied groups of social life disappear in the neutral shadow of the universal congregation or church (עדה, סֵדֶק). The notion of this last is foreign to Hebrew antiquity, but runs through the Priestly Code from beginning to end" (p. 78). It would be truer to say that our translation of these Hebrew words colors them in a manner that does not accurately represent the original meaning. When we read of bees (Judges xiv. 8) we do not postulate an ecclesiastical organization, and translate by "congregation" or "church" just because we find the word עדה; nor is it true that the notion conveyed by these words is foreign to Hebrew antiquity. Deuteronomy contains laws excluding certain persons from the קהל, and Genesis xlix. 6; Numbers xxii. 4 (R. V., "multitude"); Deuteronomy v. 22; ix. 10; xxxi. 30; Joshua viii. 35; 1 Samuel xvii. 47; 1 Kings viii. 14; Micah ii. 5; 1 Kings xii. 20, all protest against Wellhausen's allegations. On the other hand, in many cases "horde," and even "crowd," would render the meaning of the words more exactly to modern readers than the translation "congregation."

H. M. W.

¹ See *Studies in Biblical Law*, pp. 104 f.