

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

ARTICLE IV.

THE ANSWER OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM TO THE
HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE STORY
OF JOSEPH.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., OF LINCOLN'S INN,
BARRISTER-AT-LAW, LONDON.

I.

It has been shown in articles that have appeared in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* during the past few years how the modern critical theory breaks down at one point after another when submitted to adequate tests.

Amongst other arguments, evidence has been advanced to prove that in many instances scientific textual criticism kills the higher criticism. It is believed that this is so to a very large extent in the book of Genesis, and it is proposed in the present article to utilize some of the material for this purpose.

The writings of Moses have been subjected to prolonged study during many centuries, and countless notes have been written on them. Nowadays such notes are written or printed in a form which renders any mistake as to their nature impossible, but this was not always so. As with all ancient books that have depended on a MS. tradition, so with these, there is reason to suppose that many glosses have been incorporated with the text. By the removal of such glosses — assuming that such removal is possible — the text would gain in clearness. It happens that Septuagintal and other readings that have been preserved to us often suggest that words and clauses found in our Massoretic text are not original. Of course the mere fact that some authority omits a word is not in itself suf-

ficient to show that the word is a gloss; but if the result of the omission is to leave a superior text, and if the presence of the word is most easily accounted for as the work of a glossator, a presumption arises that the shorter text is the more correct. As a general rule such omissions will not affect the sense materially, though they may enhance the literary beauty of the narrative; but there are cases where grave difficulties disappear when the glosses are removed. In an article that appeared three years ago¹ I divined that Jacob married Leah seven years before he married Rachel. Welcome confirmation of this view is now afforded by the larger Cambridge Septuagint. In Genesis xxix. 30 three MSS. (E, f, p) omit the clause "and served with him yet seven other years." The statement is clearly the work of a glossator based on the concluding words of verse 27, for we have already been told in verse 28 that "Jacob did so, and fulfilled her week." It therefore adds nothing to our information; but, coming in this place, it leads to the erroneous impression that Jacob served seven years for Rachel *after*, and not before, his union with her. In point of fact he served the second period of seven years after marrying Leah and before marrying Rachel, and then served a further period of six years (xxxi. 41). Another interesting example occurs in xxi. 1, where the Septuagintal MS. n omits the words "And the Lord did unto Sarah as he had spoken." This leaves the sense unaffected, but it makes the narrative more vigorous and robs the higher critics of a "doublet." Examination of the text suggests too that the lists of words on which the critics often place so much reliance are largely due to the interpolations of glossators. We shall find instances in the narrative we are to examine.

A particularly favorable example of the use of textual crit-

¹ *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1907, pp. 14 f.

icism is to be found in the story of Joseph. It will be best to omit chapter xxxvii. for the present, because it calls for the weighing of rather delicate arguments, and this can be better effected in the light of the experience to be gained by first considering the text of the later chapters. In the Massoretic text we find in xxxix. 20 f. that Joseph's master threw him into prison, "the place where the king's prisoners were bound." He acquired favor with the keeper of the prison, and so came into the position which brought him into touch with Pharaoh's two officers when they were imprisoned. But in chapter xl. we find him imprisoned "in the house of the captain of the guard," i.e. his master (called Potiphar in xxxix. 1), and it is this captain who puts Joseph in charge of the officers, the keeper of the prison having disappeared altogether and the prison itself being suddenly identified with "the house of the captain of the guard." The discrepancy is undeniable. The higher critics try to remove it by resolving the story into two.

On this view, J makes Joseph the slave of an Egyptian who throws him into prison, while E makes him the slave of the captain of the guard in whose house the two officers are bound. Mr. Carpenter therefore gives to redactors the following phrases: Genesis xxxix. 1, "Potiphar an officer of Pharaoh's, the captain of the guard"; ver. 20, "the place where the king's prisoners were bound"; xl. 1, "that the butler of the king of Egypt and his baker offended their lord, the king of Egypt"; ver. 3, "into the prison the place where Joseph was bound"; ver. 5, "the butler and the baker of the king of Egypt, which were bound in the prison"; ver. 7, "with him"; ver. 15, "And here also have I done nothing that they should put me into the dungeon"; xli. 14, "And they brought him hastily out of the dungeon."

The Septuagintal evidence entirely disposes of all this. Ex-

cept in xl. 5, 7, it confirms the Massoretic text of the passages rejected by Mr. Carpenter, and it shows that the discrepancy has arisen not as the result of the combination of two stories, but partly through the corruption of a few letters, partly through the work of glossators. The text of chapter xxxix. calls for no notice here; for, though the evidence suggests that a few words here and there have been added by glossators,¹ these do not at all affect the problem we have to consider. But in chapter xl. the matter is different. In verse 3 the words "in the house of the captain of the guard" were lacking in the original LXX and are known to have been added by Origen. In verse 4 the LXX and Vulgate read "keeper of the prison" for "captain of the guard." The Hebrew of the two phrases would be as follows:—

שרביתחסור "keeper of the prison"
שרהטבחים "captain of the guard"

It is easy to see that damage to a MS. might be responsible for a mistake. In verse 7 Lucian (supported by other Septuagintal MSS. and the Vulgate) omits "in his master's house." In xli. 10, A, the best MS., (supported by four cursives,) again reads "keeper of the prison" for "captain of the guard." These readings dispose of the difficulties, but it may be well to give the text of Genesis xl. 1-7 as the LXX appears to have had it originally, for the purpose of showing the limits within

¹ For example, the original LXX certainly omitted the following (among other) phrases: ver. 3, "in his hand"; ver. 11, "of the men of the house" (omitted by Vulgate); ver. 12, "in her hand"; ver. 13, the whole verse; ver. 22, "he was the doer of it." It probably also omitted the following phrases: ver. 5, "and over all that he had"; ver. 10, "or to be with her" (? omitted by Vulgate); ver. 20, "and he was there in the prison." The omission of verse 13 is due to homoeoteleuton (for in the Hebrew verses 12 and 13 both end with the same word), but the others may all be glosses, and indeed probably are. In no case does their removal affect the sense materially.

which variations are possible in a passage that seems to have been very extensively glossed. The readings adopted in each case rest on some evidence, but the result as a whole is obtained by putting together hints from various sources.

“And it came to pass after these things, that the butler of the king of Egypt and his baker offended their lord the king of Egypt, and he was wroth against his two officers. And he put them in ward into the prison, the place where Joseph was bound. And the keeper of the prison charged Joseph with them, and he ministered unto them: and they continued a season in ward. And they dreamed a dream both of them in one night. And Joseph came in unto them in the morning, and saw them, and, behold, they were sad. And he asked them, Wherefore look ye so sadly to-day?”

This text makes sense. It is also superior to the Massoretic in other ways. In verse 2 “Pharaoh” is the sort of explanatory addition that is dear to glossators, and so still more is the tautologous “against the chief of the butlers, and against the chief of the bakers,” a very clumsy addition to the text. In verse 5 “each man his dream” is again unnecessary, while “each man according to the *interpretation* of his dream” makes no sense. The words “the butler . . . prison” in the same verse are a very cumbrous and unnatural piece of epexegetis, and in verse 7 it is extremely improbable that a narrator who had just referred to the officers as “them” should think it necessary to explain their identity, company, circumstances, and (false) location with the words “Pharaoh’s officers that were with him in ward in his master’s house,” while “saying” is a very frequent gloss, being in fact equivalent to our inverted commas.¹ Hence the Septuagintal text is, from a literary point of view, a great improvement on the Massoretic.

The critical difficulties, of course, vanish; but it is interesting to note that our great philologists have attributed to early sources late glosses that were unknown to the Septuagintal

¹The Vulgate has *Sciscitatus est eos dicens*, i.e. “He asked them, saying.”

translators and in some cases to Jerome, while referring to redactors portions of the original narrative.¹

Genesis xli. 45 brings us to another difficulty. "And Joseph went out over the land of Egypt" is a doublet of the similar statement in verse 46. This half verse and the first half of verse 46 are therefore given to P. But in point of fact the clause was missing in the original LXX, as appears from Field's Hexapla. It is probably the work of a glossator.²

A similar remark must be made as to the phrase "And Joseph knew his brethren" in xlii. 8. This is missing in a MS. of Holmes and merely repeats the statement of the preceding verse. By the critics it is treated as a doublet and made an argument for dissection.

At this point it will be well to consider an argument that affects many chapters of the narrative. Sometimes we read

¹There is Septuagintal evidence for regarding the following phrases in the Massoretic text of chapter xli. as glosses: ver. 8, "unto him" (omitted by Vulgate); ver. 11, "Pharaoh's" (the second occurrence; omitted by Vulgate); ver. 13, "Pharaoh's" (omitted by Vulgate).

²Septuagintal evidence suggests that the following phrases in the Massoretic text of chapter xli. may also be glosses: ver. 4, "the ill-favored and lean-fleshed kine"; "seven" (both omitted by Vulgate); ver. 5, "and he slept"; ver. 8, "And it came to pass in the morning," "all" 1°, "Pharaoh" (omitted by Vulgate), "unto Pharaoh" (omitted by Vulgate); ver. 11, "we dreamed each man according to the interpretation of his dream"; ver. 12, "Our dreams to each man according to his dream he did interpret" (probably unknown to the Vulgate too); ver. 17, "unto Joseph" (omitted by Vulgate); ver. 19, "very," "and lean-fleshed" (omitted by Vulgate); ver. 23, "withered" (omitted by Vulgate); ver. 27, "and ill-favored"; ver. 34, "In the seven plenteous years"; ver. 44, "or his foot"; ver. 46, "king of Egypt"; ver. 51, "Joseph" (omitted by Vulgate); ver. 56, "And the famine was sore in the land of Egypt." It will be observed that in no case does the omission affect the sense. I am therefore of the opinion that all these phrases are glosses. It is worth noting that in verse 34 the LXX has "take the fifth part of *all the products of the land of Egypt.*"

“Jacob” and sometimes “Israel” as the designation of Joseph’s father; and it is therefore contended that we have to deal with three sources, one of which (J) speaks of “Israel,” while the other two (E and P) invariably call the patriarch “Jacob.” Like so many other critical contentions, this can be supported only by postulating a host of redactors, etc., who would introduce the wrong names at inopportune moments. Thus in xlii. 4 (J) “Jacob” comes out; in xlvi. 2 (E) “Israel” has been substituted for Jacob; in verse 5 (E) everything from “and the sons of Israel” to the end of the verse goes to a redactor; in xlviii. 8, 11, 21, (all E) “Israel” has again to be removed; and in xlix. 28 the beginning of the verse down to “unto them” goes to a compiler.

In weighing these views it must not be supposed that the higher critics have adduced a scintilla of evidence in their support. Nothing is further from their minds. Their case is that certain phrases conflict with their theory and must on that account be spurious. The case of the scientific textual critic, on the other hand, is that the textual evidence must be carefully weighed in the light of all relevant considerations for the purpose of constructing a scientific critical text, and that this process must be conducted without reference to any modern theories of date and composition.

In point of fact the occurrences of the names “Jacob” and “Israel” are in many cases very doubtful from a textual point of view, as the following table, which is not exhaustive, will show. It should be said that the Vulgate is more paraphrastic than the LXX and must be used with caution, particularly in its present unrevised condition; yet the support it receives in many instances from other authorities, and the intrinsic value of many of its readings, even where it stands alone, entitle its evidence to consideration.

REFERENCE.	ALLEGED SOURCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	VARIANTS.
Gen. xxxvii. 2.	P.	Jacob.	Vulgate, his.
Gen. xxxvii. 2.	J.	their father.	LXX, Israel (see Field's Hexapla, <i>ad. loc.</i>); 2 cursives, Jacob.
Gen. xxxvii. 3.	J.	Israel.	LXX, Jacob, with some authority for Israel.
Gen. xxxvii. 13.	J.	Israel.	1 MS. of the LXX, his father.
Gen. xxxvii. 14a.	E.	he said.	Origen found Israel said, and obelized Israel (Field).
Gen. xxxvii. 34.	E.	Jacob.	Vulgate omits.
Gen. xlii. 4.	J.	Jacob.	LXX omitted; Origen inserted it.
Gen. xlii. 5.	J.	And the sons of Israel.	Vulgate omits the whole phrase; 1 Septuagintal MS. (y) omits the verse; 2 (l, o) read Jacob for Israel.
Gen. xlii. 36.	E.	Jacob their father.	1 Heb. MS. of Kennicott's reads Israel for Jacob; 1 Septuagintal MS. omits the whole phrase.
Gen. xliii. 2.	J.	their father.	Vulgate, Jacob; many Septuagintal authorities, Jacob their father.
Gen. xliii. 8.	J.	unto Israel his father.	1 Heb. MS. of Kennicott's omits the whole phrase; Vulgate, Ethiopic, and Chrysostom omit Israel.
Gen. xliii. 11.	J.	their father Israel.	2 Heb. MSS. of Kennicott's omit their father; the best MS. of the LXX originally omitted Israel, while another of Kennicott's MSS. reads, their father Jacob.
Gen. xlv. 27.	E.	Jacob their father.	Vulgate and 1 MS. of the LXX (f) omit.
Gen. xlv. 28.	J.	Israel.	1 Heb. MS. of De Rossi's, Vulgate, 1 MS. of the LXX, Chrysostom, omit; 3 MSS. of the LXX and the Ethiopic read Jacob.
Gen. xlvi. 1.	J.	Israel.	2 MSS. of the LXX, Jacob.
Gen. xlvi. 2.	E.	Israel.	1 MS. of the LXX, Jacob; Vulgate paraphrases.

REFERENCE.	ALLEGED SOURCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	VARIANTS.
Gen. xlv. 5.	R.	Israel Jacob their father (the Heb. order being, and carried the children of Israel Jacob their father).	Most Septuagintal authorities divided between Jacob Israel their father, Jacob their father, and Israel Jacob their father. The best MS. reads Israel, but omits Jacob. The Vulgate reads <i>tuleruntque eum filii</i> , omitting both names.
Gen. xlv. 6.	P.	Jacob.	Vulgate, Old Latin, and Chrysostom omit. The other Septuagintal authorities divide as to the proper position of the word—a fact that points to its not being original.
Gen. xlv. 8.	P.	Children of Israel.	1 Heb. MS. of Kennicott's and 1 MS. of the LXX omit.
Gen. xlv. 8.	P.	Jacob and his sons.	1 Heb. MS. of Kennicott's 3 MSS. of the LXX (d, n, p), and the Ethiopic omit. There are other Septuagintal variations. Vulgate has <i>ipse cum liberis suis</i> , which may be a paraphrase or may point to a different Heb. text.
Gen. xlv. 29.	J.	Israel.	Vulgate, 1 MS. of the LXX (e), and Chrysostom omit; 1 other MS. of the LXX (n), the Ethiopic, and the Syro-Hexaplar (margin) read Jacob.
Gen. xlv. 30.	J.	Israel.	Vulgate, his father.
Gen. xlvii. 7.	P.	Jacob 1°.	Vulgate, Ethiopic, and 5 MSS. of the LXX omit.
Gen. xlvii. 7.	P.	Jacob 2°.	Vulgate omits.
Gen. xlvii. 8.	P.	Jacob.	Vulgate omits; 1 MS. of the LXX (p), him.
Gen. xlvii. 9.	P.	Jacob.	Vulgate and 1 MS. of the LXX (p) omit.
Gen. xlvii. 27.	J.	Israel.	2 MSS. of the LXX (d, h) and Chrysostom, Jacob.
Gen. xlvii. 28.	P.	Jacob 1°.	Vulgate omits, 1 MS. of the LXX reads (in the margin) Israel.

REFERENCE.	ALLEGED SOURCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	VARIANTS.
Gen. xlvii. 28.	P.	Jacob 2°.	Vulgate and 1 MS. of the LXX (s) omit.
Gen. xlvii. 29.	J.	Israel.	Vulgate and 2 MSS. of the LXX (d, f) omit.
Gen. xlvii. 31.	J.	And he said.	1 MS. of the LXX (l), And Jacob said.
Gen. xlviii. 2.	E.	Jacob.	Vulgate, the old man (? paraphrase).
Gen. xlviii. 2.	J.	Israel.	Vulgate, he; about 7 MSS. of the LXX, and Jacob.
Gen. xlviii. 3.	P.	Jacob.	1 MS. of Kennicott's perhaps, Israel. From a Latin translation it would seem that the Syriac also has Israel. Vulgate paraphrases, but has no name.
Gen. xlviii. 8.	E.	Israel.	Vulgate omits; 1 MS. of the LXX (f), Jacob.
Gen. xlviii. 9.	J.	he said.	LXX, Jacob; Old Latin, Israel.
Gen. xlviii. 10.	J.	Israel.	3 MSS. of the LXX (d, p, t) and Bohairic, Jacob.
Gen. xlviii. 11.	J.	Israel.	Vulgate omits; 1 MS. of the LXX, Jacob.
Gen. xlviii. 14.	J.	Israel.	Vulgate, he.
Gen. xlviii. 21.	E.	Israel.	Vulgate omits.
Gen. xlix. 28.	R or P.	Israel.	3 Heb. MSS. of De Rossi and the LXX, Jacob (LXX reading children of Jacob for tribes of Israel); 1 Heb. MS. of Kennicott's omits.
Gen. i. 2.	J.	And the physicians embalmed Israel.	Vulgate and some Lucianic MSS. of the LXX omit.

It is evident that the clue afforded by the Massoretic usage of Jacob and Israel in these chapters is as worthless as Astruc's famous clue. The fact is that in old Hebrew prose such phrases as "and he said unto him" were much commoner than in our existing biblical texts. Later, glossators stepped in and studded the text with explanatory notes ("Joseph," "Pharaoh," "his father," "Jacob," "Israel," etc.) according to taste. Sometimes two or three glosses would arise independently, as where one and the same person might be referred to either as "his father," "Jacob," or "Israel." It would be easy to make similar lists of the omission by various ancient authorities of other names, did anything depend on their presence or absence. But as a rule such variations — which make no difference whatever to the sense of the text — are quite unimportant. It is merely the latitude given to the glossators' taste by the patriarch's possession of two names that has given unusual interest to their proceedings in this case. There is no sufficient reason to suppose that the usage of the original text presented any problem, or afforded the slightest justification for postulating a plurality of sources, following different principles in the naming of the third patriarch.

The remaining difficulties will form the subject of a second article.