

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 IX.

THE ADVENT OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

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

CONSERVATISM has won a signal victory. Wellhausen, the leader of the higher critical school, who formerly believed the documentary theory to be invulnerable, has admitted that it has a "sore point." In 1905 he was still confident that he had shown investigators the right road.¹ In 1908 he was constrained to admit the existence of the sore point. In 1912 he has given authority for this admission to be published. It is, therefore, not a mere stray dictum, but represents the permanent and abiding conviction of years. The "sore point" is the evidence of the Septuagint as to the textual tradition of the Divine appellations in Genesis, and the man who has won this admission from Wellhausen is

¹The passage is of sufficient interest to-day to make it worth transcribing: "Einzelheiten gebe ich preis; in der allgemeinen Betrachtungsweise des literarischen Prozesses, wodurch der Pentateuch entstanden ist, glaube ich der Forschung die richtige Bahn gewiesen zu haben. Wesentlich korrigirt bin ich bis jetzt nur durch Kuenen, in den seit 1877 in der Leidener Theologischen Tijdschrift von ihm veröffentlichten Bijdragen tot de critiek van Pentateuch en Jozua; aber diese Korrektur ist von der angenehmen Art dass sie meine eigene Grundanschauung befreit von hangen gebliebenen Resten des alten Sauerelges der mechanischen Quellscheidung. Kuenen zeigt nämlich, dass gewisse Elemente die ich dem Elohisten zugewiesen habe, nicht Fragmente eines selbständigen Zusammenhanges sind, sondern eingeschaltete Nachträge, die sich parasitisch einem anderweitigen Zusammenhange angesetzt haben" (Prolegomena (6th ed., 1905), p. 8, note 2).

Johannes Dahse, who has now published the results of many years of research in his "Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage I,"¹ the most important contribution to the Pentateuchal question that has come from Germany for many years.

Wellhausen is not the only well-known German professor whom Dahse has influenced in this matter. Kittel, who formerly shut his eyes to the evidence of the versions, now sits in the congregation of converts. In January, 1912, the second edition of the first volume of his "History of Israel" appeared, and in a footnote to pages 255-256 he discusses Dahse's earlier article. As a contribution to the study of the question, Kittel's note is of small value; for it betrays the author's unacquaintance with much of the literature of the subject, and puts forward arguments which could not have been used by anybody familiar with that literature. But as a sign of the times it is very important. Kittel says, that Dahse is right in blaming the commentators and divisive theorists for having paid too little attention to the textual materials. He also concedes that, in Genesis ii.-x., the designation of the Deity in the Massoretic text has little decisive force for division into sources. This also applies to some other portions of the Pentateuch. Doubtless further acquaintance with the literature will drive Kittel from more of his old opinions. Meanwhile it may be noted that he was sufficiently impressed to set the question of the usage of the Divine appellations as a prize subject at Leipzig for the year 1911-12. Once the method is recognized as correct, the downfall of the documentary theory is merely a question of time.

Before dealing with the book itself, I desire to say a few

¹ *Glossen*: Alfred Töpelmann. M. 4.80.

words about the somewhat curious position which has arisen. There has long been a fissure in the conservative camp. Many who made no secret of their dislike of the higher criticism yet believed that the forces arrayed against them were too strong, and felt constrained to make concessions to the documentary theory. Those of us who refused to go with them were, I fear, accounted extremists; and when we took to insisting on the necessity of textual criticism, even the exiguous measure of sympathy which the mediating school had previously accorded to us was replaced by a frigid silence. This was natural, and I, for one, never felt any difficulty in understanding the attitude of those who looked askance at the new departure; but to-day I feel justified in asking them to take a fresh survey of the situation. In the year 1889 Robertson Smith wrote of the investigation into the historical order of the documents from which he supposed the Pentateuch to be compiled: "It is sufficient to name Kuenen and Wellhausen as the men whose acumen and research have carried this inquiry to a point where nothing of vital importance for the historical study of the Old Testament religion still remains uncertain" (Preface to the *Religion of the Semites*). To-day, at Kuenen's old University, Leyden, Kuenen's pupil and successor teaches views that are entirely destructive of the whole documentary theory; Wellhausen has struck his flag; and such eminent members of the school as Kittel, Sellin, Toy, and H. P. Smith have publicly admitted the insecurity of their position; while the other critical leaders who have had occasion to deal with the matter in public have given the most unmistakable proofs of their inability to meet the conservative case. On the other hand, Dahse in Germany and Troelstra in Holland are leading assaults on the whole documentary theory

through the breaches that textual criticism has made. Probably these developments will have taken the mediating conservatives by surprise; but, since they have occurred, I would respectfully submit that the time is ripe for a reconsideration of their position. The attitude of absolute silence in the question of textual criticism is no longer possible. Either they should recognize that we have fought and won a victory in a cause which is really theirs as well as ours, or else they should formulate their reasons for differing from us. If they are not for us, we are, at any rate, justified in asking why they are for *pur* adversaries.

Dahse's book falls into three main divisions, dealing respectively with the Names — or, as I should prefer to say, Appellations — of God, Jacob and Israel, and the P theory in Genesis xii.-1.

At the head of the first main division, certain topics that are inseparably connected with its principal subject are treated, and it will accordingly be well to begin with these. There is, first, a discussion of the text of Exodus vi. 2, 3 — the key to the composition of the Pentateuch, according to the documentary theorists. After pointing out that the entire body of Septuagintal authorities supported by Onkelos, the Syriac, the Vulgate, and the Yemenite MS. read: הוֹדַעְתִּי, "I made known," *not* "I was known," in vi. 3, Dahse proceeds to discuss other Greek variants in this verse. The Armenian and the MSS. *ac* have: "And My name is the Lord *and* I made not known," etc. This would involve the addition of the single letter ך to the Hebrew. On the other hand, Justin read: "And my name I made not known," omitting the Tetragrammaton, and there is other support for this. Dahse thinks that, if this is right, the passage presupposes Exodus iii. He argues that "I am the Lord,"

at the end of Exodus vi. 2, cannot be a new Self-revelation, because the formula is frequent thereafter, and cannot be a new revelation at each occurrence. That is true, but this reasoning does not seem to me decisive. It is difficult to see how a name could be more definitely revealed than in the formula here used; and, while each subsequent occurrence could not be a new revelation, it might add weight to the context by recalling the revelation on the first occasion on which it was used, and the tremendous import of that revelation. And here I would quote the admirable remarks of Dr. Troelstra:—

“It makes really little or no difference *to us* whether the answer to the question, ‘What shall I say when they ask me, What is the Name of Him who sent thee?’ be ‘I am Yhvh,’ or ‘I am that I am: thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, Ehyeh has sent me to you.’ But for Moses and his people everything depended on the *אני יהוה*. ‘I am Yhvh,’ and precisely these words do we hear in Exod. vi. 2 *et seq.*, ‘I am Yhvh, and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as El Shaddai (God Almighty), but by My Name Yhvh was I not known to them’ (or ‘yet My Name Yhvh have I not made known to them’). We shall be able to understand the significance of ‘I am Yhvh’ when we consider the peculiarities which have been noted among all primitive peoples in regard to names and their expressions—peculiarities which we must take into account in explaining Holy Scripture. I am thinking here of the weighty words of Dr. Kuyper: ‘The revelation of God to man is determined by, and bound to, the form of human recognition. For the objective revelation of the Supreme Being it is necessary that the Lord God should impart the revelation in a definite human form.’”

“ But it is quite another affair, if it is possible to find in Israel any peculiar phenomena and customs, of an origin anterior to Abraham or derived from other peoples (such as the Egyptians) which were associated originally with what is summed up under the term *tabu*.

“ The name had thus among primitive folk a great significance. For them a man's name is a part of his personality, and the knowledge of any one's name gives power over his person. Hence the widespread custom to have a secret name in order that the enemy might have no power over its possessor. The confidential imparting of this hidden name is a token and confirmation of a covenant of friendship; by exchange of names friendship can be effected.

“ Gunkel, therefore, in my opinion, has dealt rightly in his explanation of Gen. xxxii. with this phenomenon: ‘ That God evades the inquiry after His Name. . . is to be explained by the ancient belief, widespread among many peoples, that the knowledge of a name gives a power over its possessor, even over god or demon.’ God cannot yet reveal Himself fully to Jacob, because the time for full revelation is not yet ripe. And in correspondence with the form of recognition (consciousness) of those days, this is expressed in such a way that the answer to the question, ‘ Tell me, I pray thee, Thy Name,’ is by ‘ Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after My Name?’

“ But we have still before us the old question: How could the name Yhvh, which was first made known in Exod. vi. 3, have been used long previously (even by Jacob in Gen. xxxii. 9).

“ Some investigators have drawn attention to the singular circumstance that frequently among primitive peoples the name is well known, but its possessor shall himself never

pronounce it except in very special cases. . . . The universally human element, however, is in regarding the name as more than a sound, as more than an indication, and closely bound with, nay, even a part of, Him who bears the name. When we look at Gen. xxxii., Exod. iii., and Judg. xiii. in this light, it becomes clear that the question, 'Tell me, I pray thee, Thy Name,' is not an expression of curiosity, not even an anxiety to know something not yet known, but, if I may use the phrase, an attempt to place a lien upon the bearer of the name, so as to enter into a permanent relation with him. And in this aspect is Exod. vi., therefore, of great importance, because Yhvh here enters actually into permanent relation with Israel.

"We can thus compare, in a sense, the setting of our signature to a document with the pronunciation of the Divine Name by God Himself in the Old Testament. If another were to write my name, it is, in a certain sense, of no consequence—it would have no binding force. But if I set my signature to a document, I confirm the contents, and accept them as my own."

"As we turn back now to the beginning of Exod. vi., we feel that these verses have such a central significance in the Pentateuch because God Himself here says, 'I am Yhvh; formerly I appeared as El Shaddai; I now come as Yhvh.' If we were inclined to paraphrase this in other words (but in this case we should catch merely a part of the fulness involved in the revelation of these names), we should be able to say, 'To the fathers of old God pledged His might for the fulfilling of His promises; to His oppressed people He gave His unswerving fidelity as a security that He would free them fully.'"

"Exod. vi. 3 is thus, without doubt, of much importance

for the construction of the Pentateuch, but far from being the key of the position assumed by the analysing critics, it is just this verse which throws unsuspected light upon the whole design of the Pentateuch. And the kernel of the pericope to which Exod. vi. 3 belongs is not this verse itself, but that preceding it, to which it is added as an explanation: 'and God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am Yhvh.'

"Yhvh gave Himself therewith to His people, bound His Name up with them and their affairs. Now has become certain the liberation of the people: 'Say unto the children of Israel, I am Yhvh, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians. . . .and ye shall know that I am Yhvh your God.' And further on: 'I am Yhvh; speak thou unto Pharaoh, King of Egypt, all that I speak unto thee.'

"Now can appear in the Song of Moses that rhythmical expression, 'Yhvh is His Name' (Exod. xv. 3), an expression which is also found frequently outside the Pentateuch. We now understand why we find in Hosea, 'But I am the LORD thy God from the land of Egypt.'

"Now is it also clear how it was for Moses a strengthening of his faith when the Lord, in answer to his prayer, 'Show me now Thy glory,' said, 'I will proclaim the Name of Yhvh before thy face.'

"Now also Exod. vi. 3 can receive its full due. For if a meaning to this verse is to be given from a literary-critical point of view, then a document must be separated from Genesis and Exod. i.-v. in which El-Shaddai alone is used for the Name of God. But this is impossible, for this name appears only *six* times in this portion of Scripture."¹

As to Dahse's new readings, it is to be observed, first, that

¹The Name of God in the Pentateuch, pp. 54-69.

not more than one can be right, for if we combine them we get: "and my name and I made not known." This makes no sense. Again, if we try "and my name is the Lord and I made not known," we are brought up by the question "What?" There is no object for the verb "made known." Therefore I think that this reading may certainly be rejected as not original. That leaves us with the choice between the Massoretic text and Justin's reading. It is to be observed that γ , the last letter of "My Name" in Hebrew, is also the first letter of the Tetragrammaton, and was frequently used as an abbreviation for the word itself. Hence it would be quite easy for either text, if original, to give rise to the other, through the letter's being written twice, instead of once, or *vice versa*, or through the terminal letter's being mistaken for an abbreviation for the Tetragrammaton. It appears to me, therefore, that Justin's reading goes back to a Hebrew original, and cannot so easily be accounted for as a Greek variation. If there were any strong consideration to support it, I should feel no difficulty whatever in adopting it; for the balance of palæographical probability seems to me to be on its side. But I cannot see that it makes any real difference to the sense of the passage, and the overwhelming stream of authority is, in this instance, on the side of the Massoretic text. The Tetragrammaton here may be an explanatory gloss which was gladly adopted by most of the custodians of the text. On the whole, I am inclined to lean towards this view, but I do not think the evidence strong enough to justify any clear expression of opinion on the point.

Dahse next considers the fact that in Exodus iii. 4b, vi. 2, xiii. 19, xviii. 1, xx. 1, Septuagintal authorities have the Tetragrammaton for the Massoretic "God." He concludes, on

the textual evidence, that in iii. 4b there was originally no name, as np and the Vulgate have nothing, but in the other passages importance attaches to the variants. He thinks they should be connected with the Synagogal divisions of the Law into weekly portions for reading in service. I reserve comment on this till later, since Dahse has a theory on the subject which becomes very conspicuous in the last section of the book, and it will be more satisfactory to explain and discuss this theory as a whole.

He then proceeds to treat of the reading *El Shaddai*—“Almighty God,” as it is usually rendered. This occurs in Genesis xvii. 1, xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xliii. 14, xlvi. 3, xlix. 25, as well as in Exodus vi. 3. Now the LXX in all these passages renders the phrase “the God of me,” “of thee,” “of them,” etc., except in xlix. 25, where it has “my God” (ο θεος ο εμος, not μου). Various other small differences of reading are adduced. Then Dahse asks, “Did the LXX have the same reading in its Hebrew where it renders ‘the God of me’ as where it renders ‘the God of thee’?” Exodus vi. 3 reads: “God of them.” In the Hebrew we have the statement of a revelation to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob by the name of *El Shaddai*, but no revelation to Isaac by that name is to be found in Genesis. And so he concludes that *Shaddai* is original only in xlix. 25: and that, in the other passages, the LXX found אלהיך (xvii. 1), or some similar reading that would be properly expressed by “the God of thee,” etc. *El Shaddai* was inserted by some theologian who worked over the text.

From this view I must dissent for the following reasons:—

1. It seems to me absolutely impossible to discriminate between “the God of me” and “my God” as suggesting

different texts. If "my God" can represent *El Shaddai*, then undoubtedly "the God of me" can also represent it.

2. In dealing with a word like *Shaddai*, the whole method appears to me to be misconceived. A translator can render only what he understands. If he is confronted with some word the meaning of which has been lost, he cannot translate: he may guess, or he may give current interpretation, or he may omit, or he may paraphrase, or he may transliterate; but the one thing he cannot do is to translate. Now it is abundantly clear that the meaning of the word *Shaddai* had been lost before any portion of the LXX was made, and all the Greek readings represent interpretation, omission, paraphrase, or transliteration. It will be well to illustrate this by examining the various methods of treating the word. We meet with a simple transliteration into Greek characters in, e.g., Ezekiel x. 5 (LXX), i. 24 (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion), and Job vi. 4 (Symmachus, "the Hebrew"). Aquila's usual rendering, however, is *ικανος*, "sufficient." This depends on an interpretation of the Hebrew word as meaning "he who sufficeth." It is to be found in various places where we have notes of Aquila's reading; occurs in the LXX of, e.g., Ruth i. 20, 21; Job xxi. 15; and is also attributed to other translators in sundry passages. In Psalm lxviii. (LXX, lxvii.) 14, we get another rendering (*επουρανιος*, "heavenly"), and this is recalled by Psalm xci. (xc.)' 1, where we find "the God of the heaven." Then we also find "Almighty," e.g., in Job v. 17, viii. 5, etc.; "Lord Almighty," Job xv. 25; "God" in some form or other (Pentateuch, Isa. xiii. 6); "Lord" (Job vi. 4, 14, etc.); and, finally, "He that made all things" (Job viii. 3). Obviously not one of the Greek translators really knew what the word meant. In these circumstances I cannot see how the Greek renderings can afford any safe

basis for questioning the Hebrew text. We cannot say with any degree of certainty, The Pentateuchal translators could not have rendered it here by "the God of me," and there by "the God of thee"; for it would seem that they may have had some theory as to the meaning of the term which such renderings would satisfy.

3. In Numbers xxiv. 4, 16, the LXX renders by "God," without any pronoun or possessive. Dahse does not consider these passages, but I apprehend that few would question the reading of the Hebrew here on the strength of the Septuagintal rendering.

4. Even if it could be established that the LXX did not find *Shaddai* in its Hebrew original, I should yet follow the Massoretic text in this matter, because the word is so distinctive and difficult. The alternative theory propounded is, to my mind, lacking in general plausibility and in textual probability.

Within the limits of an article it is impossible to deal with all Dahse's points in this manner. He discusses the readings relating to the "God of Bethel" in xxxi. 13 and xxxv. 7, and the curious readings of the Massoretic text in Genesis xlvi. 3 and xxxiii. 20, and shows very successfully that in all these places we can get back to a better text. Then he treats of the passages where "God of Abraham" and similar phrases occur, and of the designations of God in Genesis xxiv. 40, 3, 7, 12, 27a, 42, 48, xiv. 22, xv. 2, 8, with the kindred passages in the Psalms and Deuteronomy.

On page 13 Dahse summarizes the results of his investigation so far, and points out that the examination of the textual materials relating to the passages considered proves that the Massoretic text has not always preserved the original read-

ing in the designations of God; and that, apart from the variants offered by the LXX as a whole, where all the extant authorities agree as to its reading, there are others evidenced by particular groups of MSS. representing old recensions which go back to a different Hebrew.

Page 13 brings us to the main portion of the principal division of the book—the discussion of the use of the Tetragrammaton and *Elohim* in Genesis. This is divided into numbered sections. The first, extending from page 13 to page 52, contains a full and brilliant account of the discussion of the question to date. This may be supplemented by Dr. Troelstra's in "De Naam Gods," of which an excellent English version by the Rev. Edmund McClure (from which I have quoted above) has now been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, under the title "The Name of God in the Pentateuch." It does not figure in Dahse's discussion, doubtless because it did not appear in time; but for English readers it forms a valuable and interesting supplement to the existing literature on the subject. It is not possible here to follow Dahse through his discussion stage by stage; but one or two points may be noted. On page 44 he lays stress on the fact that the ancient name *Rubel* for "Reuben" shows that in Genesis xxix. 32 the Tetragrammaton cannot be original. And in xxx. 24 the name Josephel, which has been found on old Egyptian and Babylonian inscriptions, guarantees the reading of the LXX, "God add to me another son." It is to be observed that Aquila, Symmachus, and the Syriac here support the LXX; and this argument of Dahse's undoubtedly confirms the reading which I had previously adopted on other grounds.¹

One other matter must be noticed. On page 32 Dahse

¹ *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, p. 17.

states the points on which his investigations go beyond mine. He says that he seeks to establish the readings of the different recensions of the LXX on the basis of the grouping of the MSS. which he had undertaken in his former studies. On this point I am cordially with him; for I think that very valuable work may be done along these lines, and that Dahse is a pioneer. Secondly, he claims that the use of the Divine names in the Massoretic text has been influenced by the reading of the Law in the service of the Synagogue. This point will be discussed later.

On page 51 there is a very valuable synopsis of the pros and cons adduced in the discussion up to date. The details must be sought in the preceding pages of the section.

1. For the originality of the Massoretic text:—

(1) In the Massoretic text the consensus of the Hebrew MSS. with the Samaritan and one another, and the absence of any tendency to conformity; and

(2) In the LXX, mistakes or inaccuracies of the translators and copyists, alterations out of religious considerations, avoidance of יהוה, and preference for ο θεος.

2. Against the originality of the Massoretic text, and for the greater antiquity of the Septuagintal tradition as to the text of the Divine appellations:—

(1) The fact that Divine appellations were altered in the Hebrew Scriptures, as

(a) Is still clearly to be seen in the Books of Psalms and Chronicles;

(b) Is evidenced in the Talmud;

(c) Is actually done in the highest degree in the Targum.

(2) Septuagintal variants are supported

(a) By Hebrew MSS.;

- (b) By Aquila, Symmachus, "the Hebrew," "the Syrian," the Syriac version, the Vulgate;
- (c) By the evidence of the prophetic Scriptures;
- (d) By ancient forms of names;
- (e) By internal reasons.

(3) The Tetragrammaton has been added in certain places, and this fact demolishes the assertion that the LXX translated it by "God," out of reverence for the Name itself. The additions are evidenced

- (a) By Origen;
- (b) By the Massoretic text itself.

(4) A comparison of the Syriac version with the Massoretic text and LXX shows that the passages which originally had *Elohim* have been progressively reduced in number, since

- (a) The oldest version still retains the greatest number;
- (b) The Syriac already has fewer; and
- (c) The Massoretic text has fewest.

(5) The state of the Divine appellations in the LXX i.-ix. 26 testifies to an Elohist redaction, which, however, is older than the redaction in favor of the Tetragrammaton in the Massoretic text.

(6) In the Massoretic text regard is had to the division into weekly portions.

(7) Hence it results that, in the matter of the Divine names, there must have been various editions of Genesis, and these are further discussed in what follows.

I must not be taken to subscribe without reserve to the whole of the foregoing. More stress should, I think, be laid on palæographical grounds which are included in No. 2 (e); as will hereafter appear, I am not in agreement with No. 6;

No. 4 is so worded as to overlook the fact that the Samaritan, which is certainly several centuries older than the Syriac version (whatever the Hebrew originals of that version may have been), testifies to the antiquity of many of the Masoretic readings; and No. 5 appears to me to require further study. But it cannot be doubted that, on the whole, the summary gives a very convenient conspectus of the present state of the question.

The second section of this division, extending from page 52 to page 91, embraces very elaborate tables of readings. It must, however, be noted that information about the other old Greek translations is not in all cases incorporated; so that these tables must be supplemented by reference to the extant Hexaplar notes. The next section (pp. 92-99) is entitled "Comparison of the Original LXX with M.T.," and is an effort to prove that the texts have been influenced by the public worship of the synagogue. Passing over this for the present, we come to sections 4 (pp. 99-104), 5 (pp. 104-107), and 6 (pp. 108-114). These contain very detailed and technical discussions of the readings of the Hexapla, and the recensions embodied in the Septuagintal MSS. *egj* and *fir* respectively. There is a mass of learned and acute observation. I have already said that I am in hearty agreement with Dahse in thinking an effort should be made to study the recensions; indeed, I regret that he has not applied this method in the last division of the book; and I do not doubt that he is right in thinking that they often reflect Hebrew texts that differed from the original of the LXX. Two comments, however, I desire to make: the first relates to pages 111 f., where stress is laid on the reading of the lectionary $d_2=61$. On looking up this MS. in Holmes, I find that it is a lectionary perhaps of the twelfth century but appears to

contain the portions in the order in which they are read in the *Greek Church*. No argument as to the Hebrew can therefore be based on its having uniform appellations for God in a particular lesson read in the worship of the Eastern Christians.

My other comment is that it often happens that isolated Septuagintal authorities not belonging to the recensions that interest Dahse specially are confirmed by Hebrew MSS. For example, I have compared the variants of Kennicott and the larger Cambridge LXX in portions of Genesis, and I have found many instances of agreement between Hebrew codices and Septuagintal authorities. The readings in which they agree are usually either obvious mistakes, or else differences from the Massoretic text that make no sensible alteration in the meaning; but they do prove that many variations of our Greek authorities go back to Hebrew originals.

The last section of this division (No. 7) is devoted to "Current Criticism of the Hexateuch and the Names of God." It extends from page 115 to page 121, and it shows in the most clear and damning manner how completely the present analysis rests on this criterion. Not satisfied with the admissions of Wellhausen and Steuernagel, Dahse devotes four and one-half pages to chronicling the remarks of Gunkel in certain passages of his commentary, showing that, in the view of this commentator, the Divine appellations constitute "a sure mark" which "is to be used as the starting point," is "the sole linguistic characteristic to be taken into consideration" (eleven times), etc. (Compare the statement of Wildeboer cited by Troelstra,¹ as to the employment of definite words or expressions furnishing an altogether insufficient ground for the documentary theory. According to

¹The Name of God, p. 29.

this authority there is only "a firm foundation when in the history of the period before the revelation to Moses the author uses for the name of God" the Tetragrammaton or *Elohim*.)

Summing up this division as a whole, it may be said that, apart from certain minor matters and the theory as to synagogue readings, it represents a very able, learned, and convincing discussion, which has advanced our knowledge not merely on the main topic with which it deals, but also on a number of side issues that have little bearing on the higher critical question. I lay particular stress on this latter feature, because I feel that most readers will necessarily concentrate to a large extent on the documentary hypothesis, and I trust that this may not lead to insufficient consideration of the laborious and acute work that Dahse has bestowed on textual matters that do not directly affect the higher critical problem.

The second division relates to the use of the names "Jacob" and "Israel" as a clue to documents. The first section (pp. 122-129) gives a history of the various ways in which this clue has been utilized by successive analysts. Needless to say, the tale of its vicissitudes illustrates very fully the subjective and arbitrary character of the analysis. Thus Ilgen regarded "Israel" as a characteristic of the second Elohist (E); for De Wette it was a principal mark of the first Elohist (P); according to Hupfeld it is used by J and E but not by P; while Böhmer attributes it to J. It is really unnecessary to discuss this section further. Here, again, Dahse has given us an extremely interesting historical account of the use of this clue.

Section 2 is entitled "Jacob and Israel and the Supposed Documents." It extends from page 129 to page 135, and discusses the use of the clue in detail, taking into consideration

the textual variants. The conclusion is summarized on pages 133-134. It is that if the varying user can really be taken as a clue to original sources, the following are the only passages in the last fifteen chapters of Genesis where it can enter into consideration:—

“Israel”: xlv. 28, xxxvii. 13, and xliii.

“Jacob”: xlv. 25, 27, xxxvii. 34, and xlii.

Then he proceeds to show that, even in this attenuated list, the clue cannot be made to work, and he has no difficulty whatever in disposing of this part of the analysis. This section also contains some discussion of the textual evidence as to some of the other criteria used in analyzing the story of Joseph.

The third and last section of this division (pp. 135-143) is concerned with “The Actual Distinction between Jacob and Israel.” Dahse holds that there is a difference of usage, Israel having a special connection with Shechem, and being employed in connection with Joseph and Benjamin, and also sometimes where the reference is to all that belongs to the patriarch, not merely his nearest relatives. Jacob, on the other hand, is kept as his name where the family history is the subject or where there is a reference to something that has been narrated before. This theory is, of course, combined with a consideration of the Septuagintal evidence—but not of the testimony of the other versions. A perusal of this section has failed to convince me. While I have not had time to submit the whole question to an independent study in the light of all the available evidence, it seems to me that Dahse himself has to explain away too many apparent exceptions for his theory to be probable. On the other hand, there are many incidental remarks of value, and it may be that ultimately some distinction may be traced. But the first

step must be to construct a critical text without reference to any particular theory with the aid of all the ancient evidence available; and perhaps it may then appear that much allowance must be made for the taste of individual glossators and the different choices of copyists in transcribing an abbreviation.

The third division of the book extends from page 144 to page 174, and expounds a new theory of P in Genesis xiii.-1. Here my position is the exact reverse of what it was in the earlier portions of the book. While I was in general agreement with the author and differed only on minor points in dealing with those, I am quite unable to follow him in the main views expounded in this third division. At the same time I must deal with the theory as to the effect of the worship of the synagogue on the text of the Divine appellations.

The reading of the Law on Saturday mornings (to omit all details which have no direct bearing on the theory) is to-day an integral part of the service of every orthodox Jewish synagogue. At present the general custom is to read the whole of the Law once in the course of the year. The Jewish year is, however, a period of varying length, as it sometimes contains an intercalary month; and the scheme has to make allowance for this. Moreover, if a festival falls on a Sabbath, the reading of the Law that is specially appointed for this festival supersedes the portion which would otherwise have been read on the Sabbath; and this also makes some elasticity necessary. To meet these variations, appropriate rules have been devised: the Law has been divided into fifty-four portions. The last is always read on a special day, called "the Rejoicing of the Law" (the day after the 8th day of Solemn Assembly). The other fifty-three are read

on the non-festival Sabbaths of the year, either one or two being read on each Sabbath to suit the exigencies of the calendar. The ordinary printed Hebrew Bibles show these sections of the Law.

In this matter the orthodox Jews of to-day follow the practice of the Jews of Babylonia; but this is not the only practice which has obtained. There was a time when the Jews of Palestine differed from their Babylonian brethren by observing the earlier custom of reading the Law not in an annual but in a triennial cycle. For this purpose they divided it into a larger number of sections, each of smaller compass than the Babylonian portions. Büchler thinks the annual cycle was introduced in Babylonia by Rab (*circa* 175–247 of the Christian era).¹

Dahse holds that the text of the Pentateuch has been affected by these customs in various ways:—

1. He thinks that, in the matter of the Divine appellations, the Massoretic text has been affected by the portions of the annual cycle, and the LXX by the shorter sections of the triennial cycle. He believes that uniformity in the use of the Divine appellations within a single reading was aimed at, and that this principle has caused alterations to be made. Further, he thinks that in the Massoretic text the Tetragrammaton was apt to be introduced at the beginning or end of a portion in which *Elohim* prevailed.

2. He claims that the portions of Genesis attributed by the critics to P really consist of three entirely distinct elements. The first of these is composed of ancient pre-exilic (possibly even pre-Mosaic) material. The second he attributes to a compiler who arranged Genesis for public read-

¹ Art. "The Triennial Reading of the Law and Prophets," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. v. (O. S.) pp. 420–468.

ing, and divided it into the short portions of the triennial cycle. The third consist of late glosses — subsequent to the work of the compiler. Then he points to Nehemiah viii., where we are told of Ezra's reading and expounding the Law, and he identifies the compiler who was responsible for his second category with Ezra. He prints tables showing what parts of P in Genesis xii.-l. he attributes to these sources respectively. Of the fact that the one set of readings represents the practice of the Babylonian Jews and the other that of the Palestinian, he makes no mention.

For the sake of clearness I state his views in another way. Ezra found a Pentateuch in existence. He introduced the practice of public weekly readings, and for this purpose he edited the Pentateuch with additions of an explanatory nature. Subsequently his text was heavily glossed and the system of reading was modified, an annual cycle being substituted for a triennial. To meet this, the text was divided into the larger sections current to-day, and changes were introduced into the text of the Divine appellations, partly in order that uniformity might prevail within the limits of a single portion, partly in order that the Tetragrammaton might be introduced at the beginning or end of a portion.

I cannot accept either branch of the theory, and I shall therefore set out shortly some of the reasons that influence me. It is necessary to deal with the two branches separately to some extent, because the one part might be true and not the other. At the same time there are some reasons that apply to both equally, and accordingly it will be well to begin with these.

Throughout the investigation Dahse has taken into account only the Massoretic text and the Septuagint. But other ancient texts have been preserved to us; and, when

these are taken into consideration, it becomes difficult to understand how the theory can be made to fit in with the data. It is particularly necessary to remember the Samaritan Pentateuch, because it so often supports the Massoretic text against LXX. Let us begin with the illustration of its value for testing the hypothesis afforded by its readings as to the Divine appellations. In the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* for 1903, Dahse published a list of its differences from the Massoretic text. The following are the cases in Genesis:—

Tetragrammaton for Massoretic *Elohim*: Genesis vii. 9, xxviii. 4, xxxi. 7, 9, 16.

Elohim or *ha-Elohim* for Massoretic Tetragrammaton: Genesis .viii. (not, however, in Petermann's codex) xiv. 22, xx. 18.

That is to say, it agrees with the Massoretic text in all save eight places. Practically, therefore, we must proceed on the footing that, if Dahse's hypothesis be true, the annual cycle was already in vogue at the time that the Samaritan separated from the Hebrew, and that the necessary changes had already been made. But how does that fit in with the fact that authoritative versions made centuries later do not confirm the Massoretic text? How are we to explain, e.g., the fact that, in xxx. 24, Aquila, Symmachus, and the Syriac all agree with the LXX in preserving the original reading "God"? Surely Aquila, of all people, would have been acquainted with the official text of the Synagogue. Again, if there is anything in Dr. Büchler's view that the annual cycle was introduced by Rab, the Samaritan text could obviously not have been influenced by it. Once more, test the theory of the disagreements of the Vulgate with the combined Massoretico-Samaritan text. Jerome, the great

believer in the *Hebraica veritas*, often presents readings that are superior to those of the Samaritans and Massorettes, and receives more or less support from Septuagintal authorities. Take, for example, Genesis xxxv. 9, 10, and compare the following texts:—

MASSORETIC TEXT.

9 And Elohim appeared unto Jacob again, when he came from Paddan-aram, and [Sam. inserts Elohim] blessed him.

10 And Elohim said unto him, Thy name is Jacob: thy name shall not be called any more Jacob [M. T. has the words in the order "thy name any more Jacob"; Sam. "any more thy name Jacob"], but Israel shall be thy name: and he called his name Israel.

DAHSE.

Ezra:—And Elohim appeared unto Jacob [glossator, "again"] when he came from Paddan (Aram) [glossator, "in Luz"] and blessed him. And Elohim said unto him: Thy name is Jacob; thy name shall not be called any more Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name [glossator, "and he called his name Israel"].

VULGATE.

And Elohim appeared unto Jacob again, when he came from Paddan-aram and blessed him, saying, Thou shalt not be called any more Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name; and he called him Israel.

When we compare the text of the Vulgate with the Hebrew, we see that it contains everything that the Hebrew has, but in a shorter form. The style is better. If, in any secular writing, a critical editor found that some authorities presented the reading "A came and A said," while others had "A came and said," the shorter and more elegant version would be preferred in the absence of reasons to the contrary. In dealing with the Hebrew scriptures, there is an additional reason, based on Jewish psychology, for following this course. The tendency of the Jew has been to put a fence about the Law—to lean in the direction of excessive conscientiousness. It is easy to understand that there was a time when this national characteristic was mirrored

in the treatment of the text, and led to amplificatory glosses. Now, if we examine the Septuagintal witnesses as to this text, we shall find that they are at sixes and sevens, obviously as a result of various attempts to combine an original Septuagintal text which supported the Vulgate with the present Massoretic text. Taking the readings at the beginning of verse 10, we find that where Vulgate has merely "saying," Dahse accepts the reading "and Elohim said unto him." But he omits "unto him": while Ddfhtc₂, the Sahidic, the Ethiopic, and Chrysostom omit "Elohim." Then the clause "Thy name is Jacob," which appears to be a note, and is wanting in the Vulgate, is not to be found in A or bw or dp or fir or m. Next the Vulgate has "thou shalt not be called," for "thy name shall not be called." Here the Bohairic supports it, while r and the Ethiopic misplace the phrase "thy name," thus lending further color to the view that it is a later insertion. In testing Dahse's theory, we must ask, How came it about that words written by Ezra were unknown to Jerome some eight and one half centuries later, although they are present in the Samaritan text as well as the Massoretic text, so that, on the theory, they must have been read officially in all synagogues whether the annual or the triennial cycle was in vogue? It seems to me that the joint evidence of the other texts is incompatible with the theory.

Before passing away from Genesis xxxv. 9 f., I may note two other matters. As already indicated, I do not think that Dahse has treated the text critically enough. Many words that he retains appear to me, in the light of the ancient evidence, to be glosses. We have had some instances already. To these I may add a couple of examples. In xxxv. 15, "And Jacob called the name of the place where

God spake with him, Bethel." Here "Jacob" is omitted by egj, the Armenian, and Chrysostom. It is totally unnecessary in the context. "Where God spake with him"—another wholly superfluous gloss—is wanting in n, the Ethiopic, and the Vulgate. Dahse accepts both these glosses, and attributes the verse as a whole to Ezra. On the other hand, I think he is sometimes too prone to accept a Septuagintal variant without sufficient consideration. I of course agree with him in rejecting the words "and he called his name Israel," for these were missing from the text of the original LXX, and were added by Origen; but I do not think he is sufficiently critical in regard to the word "again" in verse 9. He says that it is omitted by two cursives, the Bohairic, and the Sahidic; but this is not quite a full account. The two cursives and the Bohairic read *ovtl*, "being," for *etl*, "again." This looks like a Greek rather than a Hebrew corruption. At the same time the word is omitted by the Sahidic and the Ethiopic, and may not have been part of the original text.

I return to the consideration of the Ezra theory. Apart from the difficulty already mentioned, I think that the following reasons militate against it:—

1. The statement in Nehemiah viii. 8 reads as follows: "And they read in the book in [8 MSS. LXX, Syr., Vulg., "of"] the law of God with an interpretation; and they gave the sense and caused them to understand the reading." Fairly understood, this could not possibly cover the addition of such passages as xxvii. 46–xxviii. 5, xxxi. 3, xlvi. 1–6 (omitting 2b, which Dahse assigns to Ezra's editorship). The action here postulated is something entirely different from the exposition contemplated by Dahse's proof-text.

2. The hypothesis is based on the documentary theory.

It starts with P and proceeds to examine its constituent elements. But

(1) If textual criticism be applied to the Pentateuch, the P theory cannot stand, for the lists of words and other proofs (quite apart from the criterion of the Divine appellations, which Dahse himself has so ably demolished) are often based on late glosses or corruptions. The first task must be to get as near as possible to the original text, without regard to any documentary hypotheses. There is not the least reason to suppose that when this has been done there will be a P or anything like it.

(2) The argument from contexts applies with full force to this hypothesis. For instance, xxx. 22a, "And God remembered Rachel," is assigned to Ezra. But then we read "And God hearkened to her," etc., as the preëxisting narrative. This, however, would be nonsense, for no other mention has been made of Rachel, and the "her" consequently could only refer to Leah or Dinah. Or take xlviii. 2b. This is attributed to the ancient narratives, the context being given to Ezra. Apparently, therefore, the original text had xlv. 31, xlvi. 2b, 7, consecutively thus: "And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head, and Israel strengthened himself; and sat upon the bed, And as for me when I came," etc. Similarly, xlix. 29, as part of the old narrative, apparently follows xlviii. 22, and is addressed to Ephraim and Manasseh. It is unnecessary to develop this argument further here, but it would be quite easy to expand it.

3. While there is occasional glossing near the beginning or the end of the sections in many cases, this feature is not distinctive of these passages. On the contrary, the rest of the text is also heavily glossed, alike in the parts assigned to P, and in those attributed to JE. Anybody who chooses

to examine some chapters of Genesis in the light of the textual materials without reference to the documentary theory can convince himself of this.

4. While there is no certainty as to the date of the introduction of the practice of reading the Law in public worship, such evidence as exists has led Dr. Büchler to conjecture that it originated in opposition to the Samaritans, who took different views as to the meaning of certain passages of the Pentateuch relating to the festivals. He thinks that, to meet this, the custom of reading and explaining the disputed passages on the festivals in question was introduced, and that it was from this that the practice developed. His whole article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (above cited) is very interesting and instructive; and, while there does not appear to be any really cogent evidence of date available, the general impression left by its perusal is decidedly unfavorable to Dahse's theory.

In view of the above, it is perhaps justifiable to deal more briefly with the branch of the hypothesis that concerns the Divine appellations. I do not think that Dahse has proved his case as to the changes insuring uniformity, for I cannot see that there is any great uniformity in the lists he gives. Thus we have portions that are purely Elohistic, portions in which the initial sections use the Tetragrammaton, while the end is Elohistic, portions where the Tetragrammaton is used regularly except at the beginning or end, where *Elohim* appears — though, on the theory of the preference of the Tetragrammaton at the beginning or end of the section, this should not be so. Similarly, in the examples he cites from Exodus, the Massoretic text appears to have *Elohim* at the beginning of a portion where the LXX read the Tetragrammaton. Again, there are instances where the non-Mas-

soretic reading shows greater uniformity with the context than our present Hebrew.

Further, if Dahse is right (as I think he is) in distinguishing at least four Hebrew texts, three of which are represented in Septuagintal authorities, it becomes impossible to account for *all four* on any hypothesis of two systems of public reading. Then, too, it is said that there are similar phenomena in the texts of, e.g., the books of Samuel, where it cannot be suggested that the service of the Synagogue has influenced the readings. Lastly, even if it could be shown that alterations had been made to insure uniformity for the purposes of public reading, the inquiry would only be carried back a step, and we should be faced with the question: "What is the explanation of the alternations in the use of the Divine appellations which it was sought to modify for the purposes of such readings?"

My own view is that, for the purposes of any further intail if necessary, I am compelled to express dissent from the theories put forward. I do it with some regret, because I feel that there is very much in the book that is of great value, and new ideas are always welcome.

My own view is that, for the purposes of any further investigation of the use of the Divine appellations, two steps are necessary:—

1. Efforts should be made to disentangle the different recensions that have come down to us, and trace the characteristics of their texts. I gratefully acknowledge the work already done by Dahse in this field, and I sincerely hope that it may be followed up in subsequent parts of the "Text-kritische Materialien." I should like to see the Hebrew variants and the other ancient versions brought forward in addition to the Greek MSS: and of course the work should

not be limited to the Divine appellations, but extend to the whole text.

2. The next step would be to restore the original of the Divine appellations wherever possible. We have seen that there are many passages where, for one reason or another, it is feasible to restore the original text. This should be done wherever practicable.

Then, when the characteristics of the various recensions are clearly appreciated, and their value has been ascertained in all passages where satisfactory tests are available, we shall be able to draw inferences as to the tendencies that have influenced them, and as to the value of their respective readings in other passages where no certain tests can be found.

The book closes with what is very rare in German publications, an excellent index of texts.

While I have found it necessary to devote more space to points on which I differ from the author than to those on which I agree, I cannot leave the volume without expressing my firm conviction that its appearance will mark an epoch in German Old Testament studies. Whatever opinions may be held as to details, this work makes it impossible, once for all, to treat the Massoretic text of Genesis—and consequently of the Pentateuch—as if no other materials existed. Henceforth textual science cannot be ignored by German professors. They will have to reckon with innumerable facts to which they have hitherto shut their eyes, and incidentally they will be compelled to scrap their documentary and evolutionary theories. Further issues of the “*Textkritische Materialien*” will be awaited with eager interest.