

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 VI.

HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH.

A REPLY TO DR. KÖNIG.

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

I.

THE following pages have been written in reply to Dr. Eduard König's "Die moderne Pentateuchkritik und ihre neueste Bekämpfung," in which the author criticized certain of my positions. I wish to make it clear at the very outset that this reply is written consciously and intentionally in the interest of a totally different method of studying the ancient books of Israel from that pursued by the enormous majority of modern theologians. The method followed and the spirit that gave rise to that method are those of the historical school. I seek to understand the narratives and laws of the Mosaic age by reference to the conditions under which Moses had to work and the problems he was called upon to solve, always remembering that "the roots of the present" — every present — "lie deep in the past," and that in considering the results of human labors we must never forget to take into account the known and inevitable tendencies of human nature. And as with the actions of Moses and his contemporaries, so with the conduct of those who have had to transmit the text throughout the ages. The student of the history of the Mosaic period is no more entitled to disregard the influences that

have molded the documents that relate to it into their present form than to neglect the motives that influenced Moses himself. Our record of those days in the form in which we have it can be understood intelligently only if three conditions be observed. In the first place, we are to remember that we are dealing with a narrative of the *historical* events of a most critical period in which supreme statesmanship was displayed. Secondly, we must bear in mind that this narrative was couched in the language of the people and imbued with the ideas and mental habits of the people, place, and epoch. Thirdly, we must never forget that the documents which embodied it have passed through a long and troubled history that now extends over a century of generations, and have undergone the vicissitudes that are inseparable from such a history, with all its changes in orthography and character, natural decay of the physical materials on which the documents were written, scribal errors, glossators' true and false explanations and amplifications, and editorial efforts — often misdirected — to remedy the confusions which these causes were seen to have introduced.

It will be observed that the textual criticism which I advocate and seek to practice is essentially a branch of *historical* criticism — always illuminated by its spirit and methods, ever seeking to test and strengthen its results by reference to *historical* probabilities and *historical* results. In my view the crying need of the Old Testament is *competent historical* research. After what has been said, it is perhaps unnecessary to add anything more about the adjective "historical"; but the other epithet "competent" cannot be passed by in silence. I demand of the investigator far greater qualities of impartiality, thoroughness, care and accuracy, and a much more

scientific equipment than the ordinary theologian¹ can show. An illustration will show my meaning. There is no man of average sense who would seek an opinion on any legal question that touched his own interests from a theologian or a philologist. He would go to a lawyer. Yet men who are absolutely devoid of legal training of any sort or kind venture the most confident statements about the most abstruse points of a difficult archaic legislation that was intended for a state of society with the conditions and ideas of which they are totally unfamiliar.² In reality, training in dealing with law and the power of applying the comparative and historical methods are indispensable to a successful result. Curiously enough, the importance of the comparative method is readily conceded in the case of primitive religious institutions; but the very men who are readiest to use it there seem actually to be ignorant of its existence when their studies lead them to consider ancient law. And it is not merely the power to apply particular methods that I desiderate in the investigator. We shall have to note again and again that the want of the other qualities to which reference has been made has been responsible for the misunderstanding of historical and legal texts, — a misunderstanding that constantly reads into laws and narratives ideas and statements that are utterly unwarranted by the language of the documents, and are subjectively imported by men whose vision has been so perverted

¹ I expressly exclude Roman Catholic theologians from this remark, since they are favorably distinguished by the superior clearness of thought which characterizes their Old Testament work. Probably this is due to the study of the Canon Law, which would give them some legal training. A Catholic friend, however, to whom I have shown this note, attributes the superiority "to the stern drilling in logic and public discussion which we all get."

² Compare what I have said in *The Origin of the Pentateuch*, pp. 58-60.

by their theory that they can no longer take an objective view of any text, however clear, when once the theory is involved. If this sounds harsh, it will, at any rate, be seen to be completely justified by what follows, and accordingly we will proceed forthwith to the consideration of the matters that König has urged against me. As substance is more important than form, I turn, in the first instance, to the arguments derived from it.

THE TENT OF MEETING.

The first difficulty of substance adduced by König¹ (p. 96) for the justification of the current critical hypothesis is that connected with Exodus xxxiii. 7-11, where we are told that "Moses pitched a tent outside the camp of the Israelites," etc. He says, very truly, that the name "Zelt der Verabredung oder Begegnung" (R.V., "Tent of Meeting") is important. "The name given to this tent . . . is the determining factor, because this name which remains constant cannot have been given to two tents at the same time, and in the instructions for the erection of the tent of meeting in Exodus xxvi. 1 ff. nothing is said of replacing an older tent of meeting." He then admits that in xxxiii. 7 the translation "a tent," instead of "the tent," is possible; though he thinks the latter translation preferable, and refers it to the tent where, according to JE, the Ark of the Covenant (Num. x. 33; xiv. 44) stood. In addition, he says that xxxiii. 7-11 cannot be separated from Numbers x. 33; xi. 24, 26 f.; xii. 4. Here the tent is, in his view, outside the camp, and precedes the host, as in Deuteronomy x. 11. But in xiv. 44 the ark is

¹Where no particulars are given, a reference to König relates to *Die moderne Pentateuchkritik und ihre neueste Bekämpfung, beurteilt von D. Dr. Eduard König. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhdlg. Werner Schöll.*

within the camp, and the Tent of Meeting, constructed according to Exodus xxxv.-xl., stands in the center of the camp (Num. ii. 2, 17; v. 1-4; ix. 17) and marches between sections of the host (Num. ii. 17; x. 17, 21). "Consequently it must be recognized that Israel's recollection of the position of the tent of meeting relatively to the camp and to the arrangement of the people on the march is not presented to us in the Pentateuch as self-consistent" (p. 97).

Let us begin by considering whether this view of Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 is possible. This tent, says König, is the home of the Ark. Well, the ark had not yet been constructed, according to our present text of Exodus. Let us assume, however, that this passage was originally preceded by an account of the construction of the Ark, and that this has been omitted at some stage in the literary history of the Pentateuch. What follows? According to Exodus xxxiii. 7, Moses used to take this tent and pitch it *for himself*. Now on the page of my "Pentateuchal Studies" (149) to which König here refers, I had cited Driver's explanation *ad loc.*: "It [the tent] was intended particularly for his own use, in his converse with God." I then continued: "Exactly; and, that being so, it cannot (as Dr. Driver believes) have been the abode of the Ark. It is incredible that Moses should have been in the habit of taking the shelter of the Ark, and pitching it particularly for his own use while leaving the Ark in the camp in a denuded and unprotected condition." König has said not a word on this point. And yet it is very important. Is it really credible that any Hebrew narrator, having told of the construction of a tent expressly for the Ark, proceeded to narrate that Moses habitually carried off this tent *for his own use elsewhere, leaving the Ark neglected and unattended?* The answer can only be in the negative; and therefore, even

if we assume that this narrative was originally preceded by an account of the construction of the Ark, the critical hypothesis is indefensible. But, in fact, there is not the slightest ground for such an assumption. On the same page of my "Pentateuchal Studies," I had pointed out that Driver had failed to meet the other points I had urged¹ which make the critical view impossible; and, as a like remark applies to König, I proceed to deal with them.

A very important passage in "E," the imaginary document to which Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 is supposed to belong, has been overlooked. This is Exodus xviii. Jethro there comes to Moses "in the wilderness where he was encamped, at the mount of God." That is to say, this chapter relates to the period at Horeb; and, according to Deuteronomy i. 6-19, the episode of the appointment of judges took place shortly before the departure from that mountain. It therefore refers to a later period than Exodus xxxiii. 7-11; and this view is confirmed by xxiv. 12-14, which knows nothing of the judicial system here organized. Consequently the chronological order of these two passages is Exodus xxxiii. 7-11; xviii., not the other way round; and we shall see immediately that there are other clues to the true position of Exodus xxxiii. But, first, I wish to emphasize the importance of the comparison of these two passages. Both are supposed to belong to E, and both deal with the same class of business. In xxxiii. 7 every one who seeks the LORD goes out to the Tent outside the camp. When Moses goes out, the people rise up and stand, every man at his tent door, and look after him (ver. 8-10). In Exodus xviii. 13-16 we again see the people coming to Moses to inquire of God, but the circumstances are differ-

¹ See *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 90-102; *The Origin of the Pentateuch*, pp. 53-56; *Expositor*, May, 1912, pp. 476-480.

ent. There is no going out of the camp. Moses transacts his judicial business in the camp — as is shown by the presence of the people — and they crowd round him. This was what happened at a later period, just before the departure from Horeb, and Jethro makes suggestions which lead to a further development of the system. But for the moment we are concerned to lay stress on the fact that in E the representation is not uniform. At the earlier date, the business is transacted outside the camp; at the later, within. Now the documentary theory does not explain that, but textual criticism can. If Exodus xxxiii. 7–11 is misplaced — and to anticipate what will be shown later should stand immediately after xiii. 22 — the narrative not of E only, but of the Pentateuch as a whole, with reference to the scene of judicial business, becomes clear, intelligible, and consistent. Immediately after the departure from Egypt, before there was yet any ark or judicial organization, some arrangement had to be made for dealing with judicial business. It was provided that Moses should hear cases in the manner described in Exodus xxxiii. 7–11. That continued till he ascended the Mount for forty days. When he was about to do so, the question naturally arose, What is to happen to current judicial business in the meanwhile? Interim arrangements had to be made; and, accordingly, we read in xxiv. 14 that Moses said unto the elders: “Behold, Aaron and Hur are with you; whosoever hath a cause, let him come near unto them.” (In passing, I would note how unnatural it would be to find such interim arrangements if there had originally been no previous mention of the ordinary permanent arrangements.) Then Moses receives the command for the construction of the abode of the Ark, and this contains the passage “And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee” (Ex. xxv. 22; cp. xxix. 42 f.;

Num. vii. 89; Lev. i. 1, etc.). From the time of its erection, therefore, this supersedes the earlier tent which had been used outside the camp. Accordingly, at the time of Jethro's visit, at a later stage, Moses sits in the center of the camp. Jethro sees that he is overwhelmed with work, and proposes a scheme of judicial reorganization under which ordinary cases were disposed of by lower courts, while matters of exceptional difficulty were brought to Moses, and this is adopted (xviii. 13-27). Thereafter we see this scheme in operation. In Leviticus xxiv. 10-23 (P) we read of a man cursing the Name of God. The case, which is one of the greatest interest and importance from a legal point of view, will be found fully discussed on pages 84-94 of my "Studies in Biblical Law." Here it is sufficient to mention two of the chief legal difficulties. No law of blasphemy had yet been enacted, and — more important still — the question arose whether the criminal law of Israel was to be applied to a non-Israelite or not. The latter question was one of the most difficult with which an early community can be faced. We who live in civilized Occidental states are accustomed to the application of a single system of law to all subjects; but in archaic communities, as in the East to-day, law is personal, and the man who is not a member of the same religious body or of the same nationality is subject to different law. Accordingly the case was brought to Moses, and settled by him in accordance with the divine command. Similarly with the case of the man who gathered sticks on the Sabbath (Num. xv. 32-36 (P)). There again there was a special difficulty, and the matter was brought before Moses and Aaron and all the congregation, but settled by Moses on the divine command. Again, the death of Zelophehad without male issue raised new and difficult questions. "And they stood before Moses, and before

Eleazar the priest, and before the princes and all the congregation, *at the door of the tent of meeting*" (Num. xxvii. 2; cp. xxxvi. (P)). There can be no doubt here as to the *locus in quo*; and in this instance, too, Moses "is for the people to Godward and brings the case unto God." But Moses was only a mortal. What was to happen on his death? We have seen him in the later cases sitting with the priest and the princes and all the congregation, settling all matters himself under the divine direction, but still helping to train those who sat with him. And in Deuteronomy provision is made for the continuation of this system and the filling of the gap that would be left by the lawgiver's death. Cases of difficulty were in the future to be brought before "the priests the Levites, and the judge that shall be in those days," and their adjudication was to be final (Deut. xvii. 8-13). The princes, of course, would be scattered over the country after the conquest, not resident in the capital, so that they would not be available for the purpose, but their place is to be taken by Levites in the capital. Thus, once the true positions of Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 and xviii. are recognized, the Pentateuch presents a thoroughly harmonious and intelligible account of the growth of the judicial system from the Exodus to the conquest and of the seat of the highest court during that period.

It remains to consider, first, what effect the transposition of Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 has on the other strands of narrative; and, secondly, whether the other points raised by König as to the position of the tent and ark are sound.

I begin with the narratives as to Joshua. In the present order of the text, Joshua makes his first appearance, without introduction, in Exodus xvii. 9-14 (E), where we read: "And Moses said unto Joshua," etc. We meet him again,

acting as the minister of Moses, in xxiv. 13; xxxii. 17 (both E), and then suddenly, in xxxiii. 11 (E), we find him designated as "his minister Joshua, the son of Nun, a young man." It leaps to the eyes that this passage is far more suitable for the first introduction of Joshua than Exodus xvii., nor does the documentary theory provide any answer to this, for all the narratives in question are assigned to the same source E. On the theory, therefore, E first related various actions of Joshua, and then at a later period explained who he was. Nor can this argument be met by suggesting that Exodus xvii. 8-16 should stand later than it does in our present text, for (a) No such transposition could remove the difficulties created by the fact that xxiv. 13; xxxii. 17 at present precede xxxiii. 11; (b) Deuteronomy xxv. 17 f. shows that the Amalek episode should stand in its present early position; (c) So does the mention of Rephidim in Exodus xvii. 8; (d) The words "then came Amalek," in the same verse, suggest that the Amalekites were not very near their own territory, but had marched some distance to attack Israel. Consequently it would seem that it is Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 which must be transposed, not Exodus xvii. 8-16.¹

¹ Before passing away from Joshua it is right that I should deal with the strange misconceptions that have sometimes been formed from this passage. It has been thought that Joshua is here a priest or performs priestly actions. The train of reasoning by which this conclusion is reached is as follows: In Ex. xxxiii. 7-11 Joshua remains in the Tent. The Tent was the home of the Ark. Therefore Joshua was in charge of the Ark. We have already seen that, according to the Biblical narrative, the Ark had not been constructed. Accordingly the tent cannot have been its home. If it had been, nevertheless Joshua was not with the Ark, since there is no suggestion in the narrative of its being removed far from the camp. Nor does Joshua ever discharge any priestly function. He does not give *torah* like a priest, or burn incense, or do any other priestly work. Nor was he resident in that Tent of Meeting which was the home of the Ark; for, as Van Hoonacker

To return to Exodus xxxiii. 7-11. There is another strand of the narrative that is made intelligible by this transposition. We have seen that in P the abode of the Ark stands in the center of the camp. Now in Numbers xiv. 44 (J) we find the Ark inside the camp, in harmony with this representation. In his *Einleitung* (p. 189) König says, not of E but of JE, "It represented the Tent of Meeting as situate outside the camp and preceding the march." J, at any rate, located the Ark in the camp; and there is not a word in either J or E about the tent's preceding the march. In fact, if we are to insist on making the tent of Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 the home of the Ark, we shall be running counter to J as well as to P, since the tent of Exodus xxxiii. stood outside the camp. Nor is there any sign that in Deuteronomy xxxi. 14 the Tent stands outside the camp. With the removal of Exodus xxxiii. 7-11 to the earlier position, all such difficulties vanish. It may be added that there are points on the cloud and the glory which have been urged against the Pentateuchal narrative; but, as König has not adopted these, it is sufficient to point out that I have disposed of them in the discussion on pages 82-102 of my "*Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism.*"

We have seen that the facts of the judicial system and the thread of narrative relating to Joshua, as well as the difficulties relating to the Tent of Meeting and the Ark, require the transposition of Exodus xxxiii. 7-11. It should be added that, in its present position, this passage has no connection

has pointed out, in Deut. xxxi. 14 (which belongs to the same document E) he has to be summoned there with Moses. In point of fact, E recognizes the priesthood of Aaron and Eleazar (Deut. x. 6; cp. Josh. xxiv. 33) and of the Levites (Deut. xxxiii. 8, 10; cp. Ex. xxxii. 29; Deut. x. 8); and in the passages of the Book of Joshua assigned to it we find priests who were distinct from Joshua and actually had charge of the Ark.

•

either with what precedes or with what follows. Now we have seen that the arrangement for the interim transaction of judicial business in Exodus xxiv. 14 requires it to stand earlier than that passage, while the clue afforded by the narratives relating to Joshua points to its having originally stood at some place preceding Exodus xvii. There is one suitable position for it, and only one. If we translate Exodus xxxiii. 7 correctly: "And Moses used to take a tent and pitch it *for himself*," etc., the passage attaches naturally to xiii. 22. We then hear how "the pillar of cloud by day . . . departed not from before the people," and that when Moses entered the Tent it used to descend. Thus the two passages dovetail, an appropriate context is found for each, and we obtain a simple, intelligible, consistent narrative for the present welter of fragmentary stories.¹

A few words must be said about the other points urged by König. It is true that in Numbers xi. 24, 26 f.; xii. 4, we read of going out to the Tent of Meeting. But there is nothing decisive about the expression. The same word is used in xii. 5 of stepping forward, and the passages are perfectly consistent with P's conception of the camp as a hollow square

¹In my *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, p. 99 (with footnote) I showed how Num. xii. 1 became more intelligible if the Cushite woman had only recently arrived in camp. It is now known that there was a North Arabian Cush, and the Cushite woman would naturally be Zipporah, who was brought by Jethro (Ex. xviii. 2-5) in a passage which, as we have seen, relates to the end of the stay at Horeb, i.e. to a time preceding the arrival at Hazeroth by very little. I expressed my agreement with those who regarded the words "for he had married a Cushite woman" as a gloss. I have now to add that they were unknown to Jerome, who has a superior text in this verse. He renders "*propter uxorem ejus Ethiopiassam*," i.e. he read "his Cushite wife" for "the Cushite woman whom he had married: for he had married a Cushite woman." Jerome, of course, was ignorant of the North Arabian Cush and thought Ethiopia was intended by the Hebrew expression.

with the tent standing isolated in the center. Then König refers to Deuteronomy x. 11. On looking up the passage I cannot see that it has anything to do with the Ark or the tent. It is quite true that *on the march* the Ark preceded the people (Num. x. 33 (J));¹ but we have already seen that the same J represents the Ark as being in the center of the camp when the people were stationary (Num. xiv. 44). The position of the Ark in the camp is, of course, no criterion of its position on the march. But König is in error in thinking that Numbers ii. 2, 17; x. 17, 21 are inconsistent with Numbers x. 33, for they make no mention of the Ark, but only of the Tabernacle and sacred vessels. There is no more ground for saying that in these passages the Ark is to go between the second and third quarters of the host than there is for suggesting that in x. 33 the Tabernacle is to be carried in front of the host. The data of the different passages are perfectly consistent *so long as regard is paid to what they actually say, and not to what modern writers have read into them.* Indeed, P himself in Joshua iii. f. represents the Ark as preceding the people—the Ark, but not the tent. The whole of this difficulty rests on misinterpretations that find no support in the language of the texts.

This long discussion has been necessary partly to answer König and partly to recover the original historical narrative. But there are certain lessons to be learnt from it. In the first

¹But not by "three days' journey." The second occurrence of these words is an accidental scribal error. If the Ark had been three days' journey distant, it would have been useless for the purpose of seeking out a resting place, nor could Moses have used the language attributed to him in verses 35 f. of an Ark that was three days' journey away. König (Einleitung p. 209) writes of this phrase: "But, in fact, this may easily have come in somehow from the preceding line, and Wellhausen (Komp. 101) also favours this assumption."

place, the documentary theory was seen to leave the facts quite unexplained. It took no account of the data of Exodus xviii., or Deuteronomy xxxi., or even of the fact that in Numbers xiv. 44 the Ark is inside the camp, and it rested on a mistranslation of Exodus xxxiii. 7 itself. Secondly, we have seen that the effect of the theory on the minds of the critics has been to cause them to read into Biblical texts all sorts of meanings that were not warranted by the actual language of those texts. Thirdly, we have found that the data of the Massoretic text itself drove us to textual criticism; and that, when this was scientifically applied, a series of fragmentary and disjointed narratives, which appeared to yield no consistent or intelligible account of the transactions with which they dealt, became a harmonious whole, giving a clear story that was entirely free from inconsistencies and was to all appearance historical. I may add that similar results have attended the application of the same methods in other parts of the Pentateuch. In particular I draw attention to what may be achieved in the concluding chapters of Numbers, and I invite König to treat the discussion of these on pages 114–138 of my “Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism” as if it had been transcribed here and put forward as a part of my reply to him. I have always regarded that discussion as an integral portion of my view of the Pentateuch, and should not consider any estimate of my work which failed to take account of it as just or well founded.¹ And, lastly, I draw attention to the fact that the textual operations show *pre-versional* corruption. Exodus xxxiii. 7–11 occupies the same position in all our existing texts. That it is due to accident, and not to design, appears clearly from the want of connection with the context and also from the nature of the narrative which

¹ In line 9 of p. 121, “preceded” should, however, be “followed.”

our operations have recovered. Pre-versional corruption is also attested by the discussion of the concluding chapters of Numbers to which I have just referred, though in that case it would seem that the present difficulties are due partly to the natural processes of corruption to which all MS. texts are subject, and partly to unsuccessful attempts to remedy such corruption. Pre-versional editing of the Pentateuch has undoubtedly taken place.

THE STORY OF JOSEPH.

On pages 93 f., König speaks of the story of Joseph, and sadly misrepresents what I have written. I have dealt with the difficulties of the story at length on pages 29-48 of my "Pentateuchal Studies." It would seem that König has glanced at parts of pages 46 and 47 without finishing the discussion. It is true that in xxxvii. 28 I read "the Ishmaelites" and in verse 36 "the merchants"; but it is not true that I do this because Hebrew texts have Mdm for Mdjnm. In verse 28 I follow the Septuagintal MS. E and the Ethiopic, which, be it remembered, represents a *pre-Hexaplar* text of the Septuagint. In verse 36 I rely on the reading of the Septuagintal dp(t), which is very strongly supported by the note in Field that the LXX had "Midianites," but other copies had "Ishmaelite merchants." I have shown in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* for July, 1913 (pp. 511-520), that in such notes O', "the LXX," means a Hexaplar text that closely resembles the text of G, though it is not identical with it. Therefore the "other copies" probably represent a *pre-Hexaplar* reading. Thus I have excellent authority for the readings I prefer. Then König lays stress on the fact that in xl. 15 Joseph says he was stolen: but in xlv. 4 he uses the expression "sold"; "but in point of fact both passages are

entirely accurate, as he had in fact been both kidnapped and sold by his brothers" (Pentateuchal Studies, p. 46). With regard to the supposed criterion for the separation of J and E provided by the variation between Jacob and Israel, König relies on the opinions of Sellin in the *NKZ*, 1913, pp. 131-134, and F. Baumgärtel in the *Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1913, col. 177. I therefore quote the following from Sellin: "For in point of fact we are here dealing with a matter in regard to which not only are the critics themselves largely at variance, but it must also be conceded without more ado that in the M.T., as in the LXX, the original state of the text has been obliterated in such a way that no conclusions can be built on this argument alone. We must not go beyond the cautious judgment of Kuenen on this point, which is quoted by Dahse too. . . . Here too Dahse has rightly given us an intensive reminder that we have to deal with material in flux with which we can operate only very cautiously" (pp. 131-134). That scarcely looks promising for the critics. But, in point of fact, Dahse has underrated the extent of the textual variations, as an examination of the table given on pages 35-38 of my "Pentateuchal Studies" shows; and on this point König says never a word. Let me cite the conclusion to which I there came: "The clue afforded by the Massoretic usage of Jacob and Israel in these chapters is clearly as worthless as Astruc's famous clue. The fact is that in old Hebrew prose such phrases as 'and he said' were much commoner than in our existing texts. Later, glossators studded the text with explanatory notes ('Joseph,' 'Pharaoh,' 'his father,' 'Jacob,' 'Israel,' etc.). Sometimes two or three glosses would arise independently, as where one and the same person might be referred to 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 them. But as a rule such variations — which make no difference whatever to the sense — are quite unimportant. It is merely the latitude given to the glossators' taste by Jacob'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" (p. 38). I would now quote some sentences from Robertson Smith:—

"Once more, we find that the translators allowed themselves certain liberties which were also used by copyists of the time. Their object was to give the thing with perfect clearness as they understood it. Consequently they sometimes changed a 'he' into 'David' or 'Solomon,' naming the person alluded to; and they had no scruple in adding a word or two to complete the sense of an obscure sentence or supply what appeared to be an ellipsis. Even our extant Hebrew MSS. indicate a tendency to make additions of this description. The original and nervous style of early Hebrew prose was no longer appreciated, and a diffuse smoothness, with constant repetition of standing phrases and elaborate expansion of the most trifling incidents, was the classical ideal of composition. The copyist or translator seldom omitted anything save by accident; but he was often tempted by his notions of style to venture on an expansion of the text" (*Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (2d ed.), p. 78).

What is true of "David" and "Solomon" is equally true of "Jacob," "Israel," "Abraham," etc. As the narrative came to be treated more as the written word and less as the spoken word (with all the vividness imparted by sympathetic

inflections of the voice), commentators on the Pentateuch filled out the text with a variety of explanatory glosses to prevent possible ambiguities, and also indulged in "constant repetition of standing phrases and elaborate expansion of the most trifling incidents." Then come the critics and solemnly count the occurrences of these names and phrases, with disastrous results. But by applying to the Pentateuch the textual methods which they admit to be applicable to all other early books of the Old Testament we can to a large extent remove the glosses with the help of the ancient versions, and so obtain a purer and more beautiful text, in addition to showing the absolute baselessness of the documentary theory.¹

König has been wise enough not to serve up once more the supposed contradiction between Joseph's being "in the place where the king's prisoners were bound" and "in the house of the captain of the guard" and the other discrepancies on which critics formerly relied. The textual evidence cited in my "Pentateuchal Studies" disposes of such points, but I think he would have done better to tell his readers so, instead of passing over the matter in silence.²

That exhausts the evidence adduced against me by König from the facts of the Pentateuchal narratives. Numerous other difficulties that have been urged by critics have been treated by me in my various publications; and, for the purpose of doing justice to König's textual argument when I deal with it below, I summarize here certain conclusions as

¹ Yet on p. 194 of his *Einleitung* König wrote, "In the history of Joseph a division within JE is recognizable chiefly through J's calling the third Patriarch (from xxxv. 21 onwards) Israel, while E calls him Jacob."

² I would here correct an oversight: On p. 45 of *Pentateuchal Studies* it is erroneously stated that a Hebrew MS. supports the Vulgate in Gen. xxxvii. 22. This is not so.

to the text to which I have been led by the foregoing discussion and by other studies.

1. In pre-verſional times the text of the Pentateuch had already begun to ſuffer through natural cauſes. Attempts were made to remedy the difficulties by editorial rearrangement, but in ſome caſes at any rate (*Essays*, pp. 90, *note*, 114–138) theſe attempts only made matters worſe. Nevertheless, the teſtimony ſurviving in the narratives themſelves and in Deuteronomy ſometimes enables us to trace the original ſequence and undo ſome of the miſchief.

2. After the textual tradition had begun to ſeparate into the different ſtreams which have reſulted in our preſent witneſſes, further corruption and further editing took place. This is evidenced by the diſcrepancies between our witneſſes which ſometimes, as in the concluding chapters of Exodus, reach proportions which can be due only to editorial cauſes, while in others, as in the caſe of the numbers of the Iſraelites, we are enabled to ſee the final ſtages of the editorial activity (ſee *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 155–169). At the ſame time variants preſerved in the non-Maſſoretic authorities are frequently ſo manifeſtly ſuperior to the readings of the received Hebrew as to make it evident that there are many caſes in which they have preſerved more original readings. The mutual relationship of the various texts will be more fitly examined hereafter. But we muſt firſt deal with ſome of König's other points.

It is, however, right that I ſhould ſay that an immense number of other queſtions that have been raiſed by the critics on the narrative have been answered in my other publications, eſpecially “*Studies in Biblical Law*,” “*Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*,” “*The Origin of the Pentateuch*,” “*Pentateuchal Studies*” and the article “*Pentateuch*” in the

International Standard Bible Encyclopædia. The reason for my not dealing with these matters here is simply that König has not raised them against me, and I am content to confine myself, in the main, to the positions that he has selected *for the purpose of my reply to him*. I quite recognize, however, that the critics are free at any moment to raise any of these other points, and accordingly I refer to my discussions of them.

THE PLACE OF SACRIFICE.

The only other question of substance urged by König relates to sacrifice: "Ferner in bezug auf die Zahl der Kultusstätten ist in Ex. xx. 24–26 gesagt, dass man Gott einen Altar aus unbehauenen Steinen und ohne Stufen an jedem (vgl. Ex. i. 22 usw.) Orte erbauen solle, wo Gott — durch eine aussergewöhnliche Wohltat oder Straftat — seines Namens Gedächtnis stiften werde" (p. 97).¹ The reference to Exodus i. 22 is clearly mistaken, for the passage has nothing to do with the subject. But if we turn to Exodus xx. 24–26, we shall see that König has read into the law certain words — "durch eine aussergewöhnliche Wohltat oder Straftat" — which are not there. I answered this contention, once for all, in the sixth chapter of my "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," which deals with the first three chapters of Wellhausen's Prolegomena. I most urgently press the study of this on König and all who think with him. No partisan of Wellhausen's has ever been able to put forward a reply to the points there adduced; and, unless they can be met, there is an end to the

¹ As, in this instance, I have thought it best to leave the German, I subjoin a translation: "Further in regard to the number of places of sacrifice it is said in Exodus xx. 24–26 that an altar of unhewn stones and without steps is to be built at every (cp. Ex. i. 22, etc.) place where God shall — through an extraordinary act of grace or punishment — cause his name to be remembered."

evolutionary theory, and of almost all that has been associated with Wellhausen's name in the religious and literary history of Israel. I quote the reply to this particular point:—

“I cannot pass by in silence another blunder of his in the interpretation of Exodus xx. 24. He translates ‘in every place where I cause my name to be honored,’ and interprets this by saying: ‘But this means nothing more than that the spots where intercourse between earth and heaven took place were not willingly regarded as arbitrarily chosen, but, on the contrary, were considered as having been somehow or other selected by the Deity Himself for His service’ (p. 30). Similarly, in dealing with the patriarchal altars, he writes: ‘All the more as the altars, as a rule, are not built by the patriarchs according to their own private judgment wheresoever they please; on the contrary, a theophany calls attention to, or at least afterwards confirms, the holiness of the place’ (p. 31). This has been very generally followed by the critics. I will quote only one instance. Professor A. R. S. Kennedy writes on page 81 of Hastings's second Dictionary of the Bible: ‘As regards, first of all, the place of sacrifice, every village appears to have had its sanctuary or “high place” with its altar and other appurtenances of the cult. . . . Not that sacrifice could be offered at any spot the worshipper might choose; it must be one hallowed by the tradition of a theophany: “in every place, etc.”’

“This might be a permissible explanation if we had no historical data to explain the meaning of the law; but, in view of our actual knowledge, it affords only one more example of Wellhausen's neglect to examine the facts. For instance, Saul erects an altar after Michmash, but no theophany can be suggested. Similarly with Samuel's altar at Ramah, Adonijah's sacrifice at Enrogel, Naaman's earth, etc. More-

over, if all slaughter was sacrificial, there must have been innumerable altars up and down the country. Can it really be suggested that theophanies are to be postulated in the case of the cattle thieves (Ex. xxi. 37 (xxii. 1)), or in Genesis xxvii. 14, or in the other passages we have examined?¹

“Again, in 1 Samuel xx. 6, 29, we read of David’s putting forward a clan sacrifice as a plausible excuse. To have been plausible it must have been not exceptional but in accordance with a universal custom. Not merely David’s clan but every other clan in the country must have had such sacrifices. But sacrifice implies an altar—according to Wellhausen a theophany. Did every Israelitish householder have a theophany in his back garden?

“The same holds good of earlier times. When men began to call upon the name of the Lord (Gen. iv. 26), did they do so altogether without sacrifice? Or did they enjoy innumerable theophanies? When Abram built an altar near Bethel (Gen. xii. 8), is a theophany suggested? Or at Mamre (xiii. 18)? Or in the case of Jacob’s sacrifice in Genesis xxxi. 54? Or at Shechem (xxxiii. 20)?

“The fact is that there are only two possibilities with regard to Exodus xx. Either we must translate the Hebrew, literally and correctly, ‘in all the place,’ understanding the reference to be to the territory of Israel for the time being (i.e. first the camp and its environment, subsequently the national possessions in Canaan); or else, if we insist on translating ‘in every place,’ we must adopt the Syriac reading ‘where *thou* shalt cause my name to be remembered.’ In any case the R. V. rendering is impossible. Personally I pre-

¹I.e. Gen. xviii. 7; xxvii. 9-14; xliii. 16; Ex. xxi. 37; Judges vi. 19; 1 Sam. xxv. 11; xxviii. 24; 1 Kings xix. 21. See *Essays*, pp. 175-178.

fer the former alternative.”¹ (Essays, pp. 184–186; cp. also *The Origin of the Pentateuch*, pp. 62 f.)

The next point in König’s discussion to which I must draw attention is his failure to grasp my contention as to the meaning of this law. I have repeatedly pointed out: (1) that it deals with customary *lay* sacrifice, i.e. sacrifice performed, in accordance with custom, by a layman at any point in the territory of Israel for the time being without the assistance of a priest; (2) that it extends only to certain classes of sacrifices, and is, for instance, totally inapplicable to *bikkurim*; (3) that such lay sacrifice, in addition to being found in the patriarchal Mosaic and post-Mosaic periods, is expressly contemplated in the Deuteronomic law and history; (4) that, side by side with these lay altars, the legislation and narrative attributed to JE recognize a House of God at which laymen had to appear and present sacrifices at certain times; (5) that, in point of fact, the altar at such a House was of an entirely different type from the lay altars, since (among other differences) (*a*) it had horns, which necessarily involve its having been constructed of some material other than earth or unhewn stone, seeing that neither of these materials could yield horns, and (*b*) it was served by priests; (6) that we see the House and the horned altar subsisting side by side with a plurality of lay altars in the post-Mosaic history; (7) that non-sacrificial slaughter was common for centuries before any of the critical dates for Deuteronomy, and that the Wellhausen theory on this point breaks down hopelessly when the historical evidence is examined. I have elaborated these matters time after time and most thoroughly in that chapter of my “Essays” to which I have referred.² Probably they are

¹ See *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1908, p. 115, note.

² Cp. *The Origin of the Pentateuch*, pp. 60–67.

most easily realized by anybody who will take the trouble to form mental pictures of a lay altar consisting of a large stone or a cairn of earth or stones on the one hand, and the great altar of burnt offering on the other.

Now what has König to say to all this? To the great majority of my points he says nothing at all, but he speaks of my trying to show "the private character of the altars permitted in Exodus xx. 24-26" (p. 97, note 2). That is not quite accurate. I have not suggested that these altars were *private*. My contention was: (1) that they were served by laymen, and were lawful within the limits laid down by custom, provided they complied with the requirements of Exodus xx. 24-26 and Deuteronomy xvi. 21; and (2) that they did not possess any of the qualities associated with the word "sanctuary," such as exceptional holiness or permanence. Such a case as that of the altar used by Saul after the battle of Michmash (1 Sam. xiv.) illustrates these points. The altar could not fairly be called private, for it was erected under the orders of the king himself. But it most emphatically was a lay altar: the king was a layman and so were his soldiers, and there was no trace of any priestly celebration. It certainly possessed no greater sanctity than any other like altar, and was probably disused altogether after a few hours. Then König writes: "But this assertion is refuted by the fact that the altar of unhewn stones commanded in Deuteronomy xxvii. 5 f., which was to be erected on Mount Ebal after Israel's entry into Canaan, and was [so] erected (Josh. viii. 30-35) was no private altar" (p. 98). That is true, as against those who contend that the altars were private; but the passages are entirely in accordance with my view. If Deuteronomy xxvii. 2-8 and Joshua viii. 30 ff. be read, it will be seen that this altar again was not served by priests, had no horns, and

in no sense constituted a sanctuary. The reason for its erection lies elsewhere, and is endowed with peculiar interest, alike for the legal, the historical, and the literary student. In pre-Mosaic times there had arisen a customary law — which may be paralleled from the customs of other peoples — under which men could execute a binding covenant by certain ceremonies which included an oath, the erection of an altar (a mound), a pillar, sacrifices, and a meal. The classical instance of a covenant of this type is that between Jacob and Laban (Gen. xxxi. 44–54). This type was applied with certain necessary modifications to the Sinaitic and Deuteronomic covenants between God and Israel. Incidentally it may be mentioned that it gave birth to a unique literary form of composition which we find in Exodus and Deuteronomy.¹ But in this connection I must not pursue that subject further, fascinating as it is. My present duty is discharged when I show how entirely it accords with the view that a plurality of lay altars was allowed for certain purposes (of which of course the making of such covenants was one) by the customary law as regulated by the Mosaic enactments, and that such lay altars neither fulfilled the functions of the House of God nor in any way replaced it, nor could be mistaken for horned altars of the sanctuary type by an eye-witness. Test it by the command “The first of the *bikkurim* of thy land shalt thou bring to the house of the Lord thy God.” This altar was not available for the presentation of *bikkurim* or for pilgrimage: it had no priesthood and no house: it was to be used for the one occasion only, and was not to be the seat of any permanent cult: it was built on an entirely different pat-

¹ On the subject of the covenants, which is vital to the structure of the Pentateuch, see the long study of “Pillar-Covenant and Token-Covenant” which forms the second chapter of my *Studies in Biblical Law* (David Nutt, 1904), pp. 52–83.

tern and of entirely different materials from the altar of a permanent sanctuary. No better illustration of my view could be found than that afforded by this construction.

Lastly, König mentions my point, "that an altar of *unhewn* stones as is ordered in Exodus xx. 24-26 could have no horns" (p. 97, note 2). To this he makes no reply. The reason is plain enough. In the nature of things no reply can be made, for the point is unanswerable.

I have now answered all that König has urged against me in this connection. I challenge him to study the sixth chapter of my "Essays," in which the whole question is discussed at length, and to answer it point by point if he can. If he cannot, the public will be able to draw their own inference as to the soundness of the Wellhausen case.

Before leaving this branch of our inquiry, I must add that the ordinary methods of legal and historical study dispose of other critical arguments on the legislation, and once more I must refer my readers to the materials collected in my other publications. In particular the application of the comparative method throws much light on the true scope and interpretation of the Mosaic laws.¹

THE "MARKS OF CREDIBILITY" AND LINGUISTIC ARGUMENTS.

It will be convenient to treat together of certain "positive *Glaubwürdigkeitsspuren*" (marks of credibility) adduced by König on pages 8 f. and of the linguistic points that he urges on pages 95 f. in support of the documentary theory; for both depend, to some extent, on one and the same fault of method.

¹ See especially *Studies in Biblical Law*, the legal articles in Murray's *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (1908), and *Pentateuchal Studies*, pp. 306-338.

König endeavors to create arguments where he has no standard of comparison. For example, "In the field of accident we meet, e.g., the shorter form *náchnu* six times (Gen. xlii. 11a; Ex. xvi. 7 f.; Num. xxxii. 32; 2 Sam. xvii. 12; Lam. iii. 42), and in the course of the centuries it was *not* altered into the usual form *anáchnu*, as has happened in the Samaritan Pentateuch" (p. 9). But he has no old Hebrew copy of the text with which to compare the Massoretic. For this reason his argument is without value. In reality the form *náchnu* may have occurred 60 or 600 times in the original, and our six passages may merely be the last survivals. The testimony of the Samaritan is of little value, because its orthography has been systematically modernized. It is easy now to prove the correctness of this contention, for one of König's points (p. 8) can be submitted to a test on a small scale. He writes: "Thus even in the matter of orthography there are traces of archaic character, viz., e.g., the ך at the end of the three verbal forms *pera'oh* Exodus xxxii. 25, *qabboh* Numbers xxiii. 8, and *hizqiroh* 2 Kings vi. 10, and they were *not obliterated* in the copying of the text." Yes, but on page 34 he speaks of the Nash papyrus. He thinks (p. 33) that this may "with great probability" be dated in the first century of the Christian era, i.e. half a millennium *after* the date to which he assigns the Samaritan Pentateuch (B.C. 432, p. 18). Yet in the few verses that comprise the Decalogue the Nash papyrus offers us "the older form of suffix ך (v. *supra*, p. 8)¹ twice in place of ך" (p. 34). If a single fragmentary witness of no early date can suggest that in so small a section the Massoretic text has failed to preserve the original orthography in two places, what weight can be attributed to this argu-

¹I.e. the passage just quoted.

ment of König's?¹ It is to be remembered that in other matters, too, the papyrus attests considerable divergencies of reading (König, p. 34), and we shall have to deal with these at a later stage.

Meanwhile it is to be observed that precisely the same reasoning applies to the argument drawn from the imperfect in *ûn* on which he relies (König, pp. 9, 95 f.). I have looked through Kennicott's variants² to the passages he cites in the first five chapters of Exodus with the following results: In i. 22 Sam has this termination in "ye shall cast" against M.T. (תשליכו for M.T. תשליכו), probably rightly. In iii. 12 K 95 omits the *n*. In verse 21, Sam again has the *ûn* where M.T. lacks it, in the second "ye shall go," reading תלכו. It is supported by a tenth-century MS. which has been altered to agree with M.T. (R. Hoerning, Karaite MSS. in the British Museum, p. 15). In iv. 9, on the other hand, where M.T. has the termination, the *n* is omitted by Sam, K 69, 81, 89, 95, 111, 178. "*forte* 128, *nunc* 157."³ In v. 7, K 191 omits the *n*. We see, therefore, that if we had any adequate standard of comparison, the occurrences of the form might prove to be much more numerous in the original text than in our Hebrew,⁴ and that there was a scribal tendency to mod-

¹This is the answer to his contention on p. 11: "Vor allem kann durchaus nicht zweifellos behauptet werden, dass die von mir aufgezeigten altertümlichen Sprachelemente nur Fragmente eines einst vorhandenen Zustandes seien."

²Kennicott's MSS. are cited as K, de Rossi's as R (followed in each case by the denoting number).

³It would, therefore, seem as if in 157 the original spelling has been altered—an example of a process that must have been constant.

⁴It may be observed that the names preserved by the LXX sometimes attest earlier grammatical forms than those of the Massoretic text, thus confirming my contention. For examples see *in/ro*, p. 636.

ernize the spelling.¹ Before proceeding to the textual side of the question, it must further be pointed out that there are considerations of euphony to be borne in mind which König has entirely overlooked. According to the second English edition of Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar (1910), which is translated from the twenty-eighth German edition (1909), over 300 forms of this ending *ûn* occur. "This usually expresses marked emphasis, and consequently occurs most commonly at the end of sentences (in the principal pause). . . . Some of these examples may be partly due to euphonic reasons . . . to avoid a hiatus before *ם* or *ן*. . . . It was, however, the pause especially which exerted an influence on the restoration of this older and fuller termination" (sect. 47 *m*). How far such considerations influenced the original author, and to what extent the restoration or retention may be due to subsequent editors and copyists, it is of course impossible to tell on our present materials. The form certainly occurs in books that are in König's view much later than P, and is not uniformly preserved in JE and D.²

¹ König (p. 10) writes: "These and many other instances show that the material of Israel's historical recollection was, in fact, expressed in the linguistic forms of the different periods. But this happened when the old materials were recounted in independent new works. But it did *not* happen when the older works were multiplied by copying." From the examples I have given it will be seen that, in point of fact, such changes were frequently introduced in copying, and further instances will come before us when we consider the testimony of the parallels between Chronicles and Genesis and König's own contentions about them in his *Einleitung*. His statement in this passage is directly contradicted by the evidence, which shows that the occasional old forms still preserved are merely the last survivals of a more primitive orthography and grammar.

² At the same time I think there is this element of truth in König's contention. While an old passage *might* retain the older spelling, a late gloss would never have had it. Thus in Ex. xx. 23, "ye shall not make for yourselves" is omitted by the Sep-

Euphony is also partly responsible for the use of *anokhi* or *ani* for "I" (König, p. 95). Thus the phrase "I am the LORD," without any further qualification, is always expressed with *ani* in the Pentateuch. The matter is brought into very glaring prominence by Exodus iv. 11, where in the Massoretic text we have a different phrase, "Is it not I, the Lord?"¹ Here the stress on "I" leads to the use of *anokhi*. I believe the Vulgate to be right in omitting the qualifying substantive; but, in any case, the euphonic reason for the choice of the word is perfectly clear. The question "Is it not I?" differs immensely in rhythm and the incidence of the stress from the phrase "I am the Lord." Similarly *anokhi* is generally used in the oratorical style of Deuteronomy. These things belong to the *imponderabilia* of style. It is not always possible to assign reasons for them; and often the reason may be felt by anybody who has sufficient appreciation of the little touches of Hebrew style, and yet not be capable of formulation.

Further, it is to be remembered that, in the case of these words, the difference in writing consists of a single letter which might often be inserted or omitted by a scribe, particularly in a language where abbreviations were so commonly

tuagintal authorities do f Arm Sah, and its removal improves the sense; so that it is certainly a gloss. Now the verb here lacks the *n*, though the same word in the earlier genuine portion of the verse has it. We shall see hereafter that the ritual legislation has been very heavily glossed indeed—probably because of the interest of the priesthood of the second temple in what directly concerned their profession—and perhaps the absence of this form may be connected with this fact.

¹ According to the Massoretic text. But the Septuagintal authorities B k (adding "thy") ox qu Arm read "God," and all the other Septuagintal authorities have the obviously conflated "Lord God," except the Syro-Hexaplar, which agrees with M. T. The Vulgate omits the word altogether,—no doubt rightly.

used as we know from MSS. to have been the case with Hebrew. For example, in Genesis xxiv. 42, where the Massoretic text has אָנֹכִי, the Samaritan and K 69 read אָנִי. This is a matter in which the features of the original text may sometimes have been obscured in the course of transmission;¹ and, moreover, the pronoun may often have been inserted by glossators in passages where it was originally lacking.²

Lastly, we have to recollect, in this connection, that there are some important marks of style which are common to all the supposed Pentateuchal sources, and differentiate the Pentateuch from other books. Here let me refer to what König has said on pages 151–154 of his *Einleitung*, from which I condense the following: In the Pentateuch we have נָחַק never שָׁחַק, צָעַק, נָעַקָה, נָעָה only in Gen. xviii. 10), נָשָׁב only in the Pentateuch (side by side with כָּבַשׁ), הָיָא 195 times in the Pentateuch for “she,” הָיָא occurring only 11 times. In discussing this last phenomenon König reaches the conclusion that “In any case the Pentateuch occupies an exceptional position on any one of the three explanations: as the possessor either of an older linguistic usage or of a particular relationship to a type of writing or of an older orthography” (p. 152). Then he cites the 8 occurrences of *ēl* for *ēllēh* and the epicene נָעַר (everywhere in the Pent. except Deut. xxii. 19).

¹ Similarly, when König (p. 8) relies on the fact that, while the father of David is called *Jischaj* from 1 Sam. xvi. 1, but *ischaj* in 1 Chron. ii. 13, though the Chronicles generally preserve the older form, it is important to note: (1) that the difference consists of a single letter; and (2) that in this passage of Chronicles *Jischaj* is actually read by K 17, 147, 166, 437, 494, 497, 506, 525, 606, 638; *primo* 170, 476; *nunc* 410. In view of the general usage of the Chronicler, it is obviously unsafe to rely on the Massoretic text in this passage.

² It is well known, as has already been pointed out (*supra*, p. 606), that glossators often inserted explicit subjects and objects where they were originally implicit.

Such phenomena must be considered side by side with the forms on which König has sought to rely in his defense of the present textual condition of the Hebrew.

Thus, when the matter is carefully examined, there is nothing decisive about the facts on which König relies. Both these and others to which attention has been drawn would be satisfactorily accounted for by the following hypothesis: The Pentateuch was originally composed in the Hebrew language and orthography of the Mosaic age. In the course of transmission the spelling was gradually altered through a natural process of modernization; but occasionally traces of the original, or at any rate of early, orthography and language have been preserved. Forms of words were selected by the author for reasons of euphony and the other *imponderabilia* of style; and, though in some cases the changes introduced into the text by the process of copying and glossing have tended to obscure the principles that guided him, yet enough remains untouched to show that he conformed to literary standards of a very high order in his choice of language.

If, therefore, König's arguments prove nothing, it is necessary to have recourse to criteria of a different nature. There is, in point of fact, abundant evidence of the Mosaic authenticity (subject only to textual criticism) of the Pentateuchal legislation, and I shall now advert briefly to some of this.

EVIDENCE OF MOSAIC AUTHENTICITY.

In the first instance, stress must be laid on the fact that all the laws *profess* to be Mosaic: "And the LORD *spake* unto Moses, saying." That is as definite a statement of fact as could possibly be desired; and, needless to say, it was accepted as such by the nation for which those laws were primarily intended. It is nothing to the point to speak of literary

devices that deceive nobody, for there is not the slightest evidence that any such device existed in the case of the legislation of Israel. On the contrary, we know that the prophets always spoke in their proper persons in the name of God. An Isaiah or an Ezekiel did not seek to palm off his productions as the work of Moses. When David introduced a new rule relating to booty (1 Sam. xxx. 23-25), he did it in his own name. Even the Chronicler habitually assigns the institution of the Temple services not to Moses, but to David. Nor can it be said that nobody was deceived, for, *ex hypothesi*, the whole nation accepted the legislation as Mosaic from the first, and has continued to do so to the present day. Nor is the question of form superficial. The historical situation is postulated in one phrase after another. Look, for instance, at Numbers xxvii., where we read of the case of the daughters of Zelophehad. They are represented as coming to Moses and his contemporaries. Where? At the door of the tent of meeting. What do they urge? That their father died in the wilderness, but not in the company of Korah. There can be no doubt as to the period represented. But now let us look at the substance of the law. What is the subject-matter? We have a request for an estate to be allotted, and the rules laid down in the first instance apply to the case of a landowner's dying leaving daughters but no son (xxvii. 6 ff.), and certain other of the commonest cases of intestate succession. But these are every-day occurrences. It is not possible to have a community in which land is the subject of private ownership without such points being raised and settled within a very short space of time. It is common knowledge that a large percentage of adult males in every community and every generation die without leaving a son, and the question would necessarily arise at once. Nor is it a common thing for such

laws to be altered. Then let us turn to the second part of the narrative in Numbers xxxvi. A tribal deputation comes and represents that if these girls marry out of their tribe their inheritance will be taken away from their tribe and added to the inheritance of the tribes of their husbands, and provision is made to remedy this grievance. How on earth could such a law date from a time after the tribes had ceased for ever to have any separate existence?

Or let us take the law of homicide. In pre-Mosaic times no distinctions were drawn. "Whoso sheddeth the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed" (Gen. ix. 6). Then came Moses the manslayer,¹ who thrust "a man suddenly without enmity." He fled and dwelt elsewhere, but after the death of the Pharaoh he returned. The law of Numbers xxxiv. 9-34 is little more than the systematization of Moses' personal experiences, with the only hereditary official of Israel — the high priest — substituted for Pharaoh, and the cities of refuge substituted for the land of Midian. But the principle was new, and for the Israelites of the Mosaic age very difficult of apprehension. I repeat what I have said elsewhere, beginning with the judgment of Dareste, "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 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

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

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 ancient) as Numbers 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 Deuteronomy 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” (Pentateuchal Studies, p. 288).

Many other evidences of date are elaborated in detail in “Studies in Biblical Law,” “The Origin of the Pentateuch,” and “Pentateuchal Studies.” On the whole question of the Conditions of the Law, I cite the following from the article “Law in the Old Testament” in “Murray’s Illustrated Bible Dictionary” :—

“*Conditions. Historical.* The past affected the work of Moses in several ways. Twelve tribes of common origin, historical and religious experiences, but of distinct tribal consciousness, were to be fused into a single nation. The tribal consciousness is seen at work in many provisions — e.g. the arrangements for the division of the land, the restriction on the marriage of heiresses (Num. xxxvi.), while (probably partly to counteract the centrifugal forces) centralizing laws were enacted which had a unifying effect (cf. 1 Kings xii. 26 f.). The stay in Egypt appears to have brought home to the people the special needs of strangers. Probably, too, the influence of Egyptian experiences is to be seen in the land laws, and perhaps also in some customs — e.g. the provisions

for writing on the gates, etc., though these are not exclusively Egyptian. The miraculous deliverance from Egypt impressed itself on the national consciousness, and was made the basis of many special laws and many appeals for fidelity (see, *e.g.*, Deut. xxvi. 1-11). The historical continuity with the experiences (particularly religious) of the patriarchs is strongly marked — *e.g.* Lev. xxv. f. are largely founded on the covenant with Abraham. *Political.* The circumstances of the time are clearly mirrored in many portions of the legislation. Thus the desert conditions imprinted on many laws, the numerous references to, and provisions for, the impending entry into Canaan, the fact that a complete new system of land law was necessary, or even possible, must be referred to the political circumstances. So, too, some minor laws — *e.g.* 'Remember Amalek' (Deut. xxv. 17-19). Perhaps also the failure to create a sufficiently strong central executive should be attributed to tribal jealousy and the historical factors. *Religious.* It is clear that the Israelites had frequently been unfaithful to the God of their fathers, and continued so to a great extent in the Mosaic age (Lev. xvii. 7; Num. xxv. 1-3; Deut. xii. 8, etc.). Moreover, the Egyptians and the Canaanites practised many impure cults. These two facts are manifestly responsible for many provisions aimed at particular abuses — *e.g.* Deut. xii. 2 ff. *Social.* Society was based on the patriarchal family, which included slaves. The families were grouped in clans, and the clans in tribes. Distinctions between rich and poor existed, and the 'mixed multitude' involved the presence of many strangers. Princes and elders also appear. The paternal power was still very great (xxi. 18-21), and the right to sell children remained untouched. Purchase was a common form of marriage. Divorce was in use (xxiv. 1-4). The feeling of family unity was very strong, as is proved by the

communitistic land laws, etc. *Economic.* There was hardly any trade; all contracts were extremely primitive and undeveloped. The moral conceptions on which they rest are unknown. Thus, the protection afforded to the hired labourer was purely religious, not jural. The precious metals were in use, and working in wood and metals had attained some proficiency, probably as the result of the stay in Egypt. The pre-Egyptian experiences had included agriculture (Gen. xxvi. 12), and the tribes were rich in animal wealth and pastoral experience. The laws reflect these conditions. *Intellectual.* The laws clearly prove that the intellectual condition of the tribes was very primitive. Such elementary distinctions as those between murder and manslaughter, or compulsion and intentional wrong-doing (Deut. xxii. 26), are only expressed in the most cumbrous and elementary way. Numbers xv. 22-31, with its inadequate distinction between unwitting and high-handed sins, tells the same tale. Again, the whole of the 'physiological psychology' that finds expression in regulations about clean and unclean, etc., testifies most clearly to the low level of reflection attained by the people. The scanty use of writing for legal purposes is also significant. *Legal.* Here the machinery is of the rudest. A few forms of the death penalty and stripes are almost the only punishments (other than pecuniary) that could be inflicted by a legal tribunal. Imprisonment as a penalty is never found. Hence the only possible punishment for contempt of court and many other offenses was death; and the character of the legislation is largely due to the inevitable defectiveness of archaic legal procedure."

Consequently, when the evidence of substance is examined in detail, it appears that the Mosaic authenticity of the legislation can be established without difficulty, and that archaic

linguistic forms are to be regarded as isolated survivals of the older orthography of the Pentateuch which have escaped obliteration in the process of transmission.

THE ANTECEDENTS AND HISTORY OF THE MASSORETIC TEXT.

In turning to the question of the value of the Massoretic text, it is necessary that I should recall the conclusions at which we had arrived before. We saw that the inquiries into a number of the narrative difficulties showed pre-versional corruption and editing, and also further corruption and editing after the tradition had begun to separate into the different streams which have resulted in our existing witnesses.¹ The next step must be to consider what is known of the history of the Massoretic text and its ancestry. For this purpose I avail myself as much as possible of the statements in König's *Einleitung*, so as to avoid needless controversy. On page 30 he quotes a statement of Tract. Sopherim vi. 4, according to which three copies of the law were kept in the fore-court of the Temple. One read *מעון* in Deuteronomy xxxiii. 27, as against *מעונה* of the other two; one read *ועמוטי* in Exodus xxiv. 5 for the *נערי* of the other two; one had *הוא* in certain passages where the other two read *היא*. In each case the reading of the majority was declared right. As to *ועמוטי* we read (p. 92): "Practically (*wohl*) no other view is possible than that the latter word is a substitute for *ζητητης*; so that the young men were to be designated as pupils of the scribes (lit. those learned in the law). According to this, there were at the central place of Hebrew Jewry MSS. — or at any rate one — in which the corruption of the original had proceeded further than in the majority of the copies, and this reading was cancelled." And in footnote 1 (p. 92) he writes:

¹ *Supra*, p. 611.

“That instance of the *תעטוי*, also, shows that the Jews had even then the eccentric habit of transcribing foreign words with Hebrew letters.” Yet it teaches us a good deal more. If this story is true and relates to the ancestors of the Massoretic text, we know that at the time to which it refers the transmission depended on three MSS., at least one of which must have been of very late date, since it contained a corrupt Greek word. I have discussed this matter in “The Pentateuchal Text: A Reply to Dr. Skinner” on pages 245 f.¹ and shown what results from this story. A very able and learned reviewer of that article in the *Tablet* for May 23, 1914, who writes over the initials W. H. K., has, however, suggested that perhaps the story should not be accepted. It will be observed that it occurs in *Sopherim* as well as *Taanith*, but W. H. K. may be right. He has certainly succeeded in proving considerable confusion in the Talmudical authorities. Personally I think that the story of the three copies is probably true; but, if it be not, what follows? Well, first, in that event, we have absolutely no knowledge of the ancestry of the Massoretic text, and this does not strengthen the position of those who wish to defend it against other witnesses; and secondly, the story, even if untrue, really affords some insight into the views of the age on textual criticism. The most authoritative circles had no information as to the earlier transmission of the Law: they regarded it as probable, and perhaps satisfactory, that its transmission should have depended on three copies of unknown date and *provenance*, one of which they credited with reading a corrupt Greek word, and they thought that a mere majority of one was sufficient to establish a reading as correct without regard to any critical norm

¹ *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1914; republished as a pamphlet by Mr. Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row, E. C.

or probability. It is submitted that in either event the story is not of a nature to inspire unswerving confidence in the correctness of the Massoretic text when it differs from other old texts of the Bible.

Next, we must remember that there are a number of passages where the margin of the Massoretic text itself enjoins the reader to substitute something for the written consonants (see *Einleitung*, pp. 31 f.). This phenomenon is too well known to call for illustration here. Then the old authorities state that the Hebrew text was deliberately altered by the scribes in Gen. xviii. 22; Num. xi. 15; xii. 12 (twice); 1 Sam. iii. 13; 2 Sam. xvi. 12; 1 Kings xii. 16 (parall. 2 Chron. x. 16); Jer. ii. 11; Ezek. viii. 17; Hos. iv. 7; Hab. i. 12; Zech. ii. 12; Mal. i. 13; Ps. cvi. 20; Job vii. 20; xxxii. 3; Lam. iii. 20 (*Einleitung*, p. 36). These passages are discussed at length in C. D. Ginsburg's "Introduction to the Massoretico-critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible" (pp. 352-362), but it should be noted here that, in 1 Samuel iii. 13 ("because his sons cursed God," M.T. "them"), the LXX has preserved the original text, and in Habakkuk i. 12, "thou diest not," for "we shall not die," was read by the Targum. In Malachi i. 13 ("ye have snuffed at *me*," for M.T. "it") the original was known to Jerome¹ (*Ginsburg*, p. 360, *n.*). In Psalm civ. (cv.) 20 the original reading was "my glory," for "their glory." The Septuagintal A and 94 cursives have "his glory," while three read "God's glory." In Job vii. 20, "a burden unto thee," which is still found in the LXX, was altered to M.T. "unto myself." I draw special attention to a fact not noticed by König, viz. that in some of these cases a version has remained free from the deliberate alteration,

¹ His words (*ad loc.*) are: "*Sive ut in Hebræo legi potest: ex-sufflastis me hæc dicendo.*"

and has maintained the original text where our Hebrew gives only the scribal change.

In discussing such points, König arrives at the following conclusion: "Already in those oldest known efforts to fix the text of the O. T. the *starting point* was the consciousness that a text *that had already suffered alteration* was to be improved, and not merely the fear that the original text might suffer corruption in the future" (Einleitung, pp. 46-47). And a little farther down on the last-named page he continues: "Of fundamental importance is this point only that *alterations which had already taken place in the text* gave rise to efforts to fix the text." He then points out the importance of the norm applied in the passage cited from the Talmud. The decision as to the text to be followed depended on the majority of MSS., "but not on an autograph of an O. T. writing or a model copy of any conceivable kind." "The measure actually applied in that fixing of the text at the same time gives us information as to the object aimed at by it: it was only intended to bring about a relative excellence of the text of the Hebrew O. T. The original or the absolutely correct text was not regarded as attainable. If now all this already implies that the old Jewish textual labours possess *no absolute authority*, the very same thing can be further deduced (*c*) from authentic utterances of the old Jewish workers at the text themselves, (*d*) from characteristics of their results, and (*e*) from the authority ascribed to them in the course of the centuries" (Einleitung, p. 48). König then gives details of (*c*), (*d*), and (*e*).

He proceeds to deal with smaller variations, and on page 51 he points out that existing Hebrew MSS. often differ from the Massoretic norm, quoting, e.g., the fact that, according to Cornill, the Codex Petropolitanus differs in the Book of

Ezekiel so as to affect the sense in at least sixteen passages. At this point I must digress from König to introduce some other facts that are material to our inquiry.

It occurred to me to examine the passages in which the Nash papyrus¹ has support from MSS. of Kennicott in deviating from the Massoretic text. The MSS. in question are K 5, 69, 129, 136, 150, 244, 435, 593, 681. Also, in Exodus xx. 11, K 9 has the last letter of השבת over an erasure, suggesting that it may originally have agreed with the Nash השביעי, but of course this inference is most uncertain. Now, on looking to see what was known of these MSS., I found that K 150 was the most important. It is the only one that agrees twice with the Nash papyrus: in xx. 10 it reads "and all thy cattle," in 17 it perhaps (*forte*) adds שדהו "his field" before "and his slave," as is done by K 136, 593, 681, and (in the margin) 435. It appears that this MS. alone has *ten thousand* variations from the Massoretic text, many of them of a substantial character, though of course the vast majority are only in orthography. Kennicott (vol. i. p. 83, note) writes as follows: "Habet, ut opinor, variationum decem millia: quarum quidem perpaucaissimæ fuerunt unquam in lucem editæ. De hoc codice ait Jablonski quod ad alios pertinet codices melioris notæ—*Incredibile dictu est, in veteribus codicibus ad Masoræ leges reformandis, quam isti se operosos præstiterint. Multa ibi literarum millia jugulata videas, nec fere pauciora superne vel in ventre literarum addita, E.g. in MS (hoc nostro) quod paucis abhinc annis S. Electori a Judæis dono oblatum fuit, in CAPITE 40 Ezech. CONFOSÆ extant literæ matres 94, non-matres 6 ADDITÆ literæ 16; MUTATÆ 18. Praef. Bibl.*" He adds: "Opitio autem, hominibusque *Opitianis* qui Integritatem Textûs Masoretici

¹ On this, see *infra*, p. 640.

manibus pedibusque propugnant, os obstruet *unicus* hic codex." It is difficult to form any idea of the value of its readings in this chapter of Ezekiel on the data of Kennicott's apparatus. A facsimile would be necessary for this purpose. He subjoins twenty readings as samples of its variants. Of these I select Leviticus ix. 21, where it joins Sam LXX Pesh, and a number of other Hebrew MSS., in inserting מוֹשֶׁה before "Moses." Among the Hebrew MSS. are K 129, 136, and 593. De Rossi says of K 150: "In hoc solo vel fere solo codice servantur optimæ nonnullæ var. lect. Samar. T. vel antiquarum vers." Of K 69, which agrees with the Nash papyrus in inserting ׀ in Exodus xx. 10, the same author writes: "Pretiosus cod. ob multas insignes ac sing. var. lect.," and quotes a number of passages, in almost all of which it has the support of the LXX, generally with other ancient authorities. Of K 129 (which has the same reading) he says: "Hic illic mutilus sed singularissimæ notæ," and cites passages, and again I find that the LXX almost always supports it in the instances quoted. This suggests the possibility that some or all of the MSS. which have points of contact with the Nash papyrus may ultimately be descended from Egyptian texts, and may have preserved some of the readings of that line of transmission.

A few other examples of MS. differences are important. K 1 is at present incomplete: it now lacks 758 verses in the Pentateuch. Nevertheless it presents 14,000 variations from the text of Van der Hooght (the *textus receptus*) of which 2,000 are in the portions of the Pentateuch extant in this MS. Not a few of these possess importance, according to Kennicott. They confirm the LXX in 109 words, the Syriac in 98, the Vulgate in 88, a Targum in 42, and the Samaritan in 700. The last figure presumably includes mere matters of orthog-

raphy, but this cannot be the case in the agreements with versions. Of K 181 it has been noted, on the authority of Vogel, "Eum ad Masor. exemplar non esse descriptum, ac quamplurimas habere lectiones cum Samar. T. et antiquis vers. consentientes" (de Rossi). According to Kennicott (vol. i. p. 87, note), the collation of K 182, a MS. of the Prophets only, consisted of nearly 200 quarto pages of variants, while K 224 (Prophets and Hagiographa) presented over 16,000 variants, often agreeing with ancient versions, and being derived from a non-Massoretic archetype (*ibid.*, p. 89).

Before leaving this point I add an extract from Kennicott's remarks about 9, partly because this MS. is of great critical value, partly because it illustrates the tendency of Hebrew MSS. to abbreviate, to which we shall have to recur more than once: "Éxaratur caractere rabbinico; sine Masorâ, et Punctis. Plurimas habet variationes; et abundat compendiis, in fine vocum: idque sæpius, sed non semper, sine lineâ. En pauca exempla, ex priore parte *Genescos* desumpta—*מ' עשרה* pro *עשר'*, *החרב* pro *החר'*, *שמעתי* pro *שמע'*—*מ' עשרה* pro *עשרה*, *בצלם* pro *בעל'*, *ובחדש* pro *ובחד'*, *בשבעה* pro *בשבע'*, *מים* pro *אלה'*, *בעיניכם* pro *בעיני'*, *אשר* pro *אש'*, *צריך* pro *צר'*, *בארץ* pro *באר'*, *אלהים* pro *אלהים'*, *ישראל* pro *ישר'*, *יצחק* pro *יצח'*, *אברהם* in cap 21 *decies* pro *אברהם*."'

There is, however, other Hebrew canonical evidence to be considered. On page 57 of his *Einleitung*, König compares the passages of Genesis which correspond with 1 Chronicles i. Let the following be considered with the Septuagintal readings I have added: Gen. x. 4 ¹ *ידדנים* LXX *Podios* 1 Chron. i. 7 ¹ *ידדנים*; x. 13

¹ *ידדנים* is read by K 321 (*forte*), 205, 248, *videtur* 160 and Sam (with the addition of a vowel letter as in Chron.) It is generally accepted as correct.

לודים LXX Λουδιαιμ (with immaterial variations) 1 Chron. i. 11 לודיים; x. 23 לודיים LXX Μοσοχ 1 Chron. i. 17 מוסך; xxxvi. 27 ועון LXX και Ιουκαμ (with variations) 1 Chron. i. 42 ועון.

On page 58, as the result of his survey of such evidence (omitting the important Septuagintal readings), König concludes that "the original text has not remained intact. For, e.g., *either* Riphath *or* Diphath was the original; *either* Dodanim *or* Rodanim," etc. He then points to the evidence of the acrostic Psalms, dwelling on the improbability of the verses representing particular letters having originally been wanting, as in our present texts (p. 58). But he does not mention the fact that the versions here sometimes preserve a better text. Thus in Psalm cxlv. (cxliv.) the letter *nun* is missing. The margin of K 142, however, contains the following verse in the right place after verse 13:—

נאמן יהוה בכל דבריו וחסיד בכל מעשיו

"Faithful is the LORD in all his words and gracious in all his works." And this is found in the LXX, Syriac, and Jerome. Next, he lays stress on the fact that there are passages where the present Hebrew text cannot be brought into accord with the rules of grammar or logic (p. 59), and that the Massoretes have not corrected the mistakes in all passages, though they have in some (pp. 59–60). On page 66 he points out that the Ludijjim of 1 Chronicles i. 11 represents the primary form of the plural, as against the Ludim of Genesis, and uses this as an instance of his contention that the development of the language is responsible for some of the variants. Thus, in this instance, canonical evidence, supported by philology, shows the LXX to be right and more primitive, as against the Massoretic text, just as it is clearly right in Rodanim and

¹ K 254 ומשך, where the ך is probably a corruption of ך. Probably the Massoretic text is here due to an abbreviation. Sam משך.

probably also in Genesis x. 23 (where Mash is obviously wrong), and in keeping the ם in xxxvi. 27. But here, again, as in the case of the emendations of the scribes, König has failed to notice that the LXX often preserves the older text against the Massoretic.

König does not fail to treat of the change of script and the other well-known causes of MS. corruption — changes in the use of the vowel letters, varying methods of treating the division into words, mistakes due to similarity of letters, inexact hearing, failure of memory or of apprehension, giving sufficient examples of each (pp. 66–75) from the Massoretic text. Then comes a passage which I must transcribe: “It is probable, too, that *abbreviations* were wrongly resolved. In particular, for יהיה a mere ם must also have been written at one time. For, e.g., in Ps. xxxi. 7 םִנְיָ is demanded by the contrast that follows וְאֵנִי (and I for my part), and we find it too in Kod 170.¹ Consequently the common reading םִנְיָ has arisen through failure to recognize an abbreviation. We also find omission of terminations in MSS.; e.g. בְּמֹת for בְּמֹת; consequently לְמוֹ in Isa. liii. 8 can stand for לְמוֹת (‘to death’).² Incorrect *amplifications* seem also to have got into the text, perhaps, partly from the margin” (pp. 75 f.), and he proceeds to give instances. The passage cited above as to K 9 is merely typical of a general practice as to abbreviations; any number of examples will be readily found in Ginsburg’s “Introduction.” Once more we have to notice König’s failure to recognize that, in the passages to which he

¹Psalm xxx. 7 in LXX, which reads *ἐμνησας*: Vulgate *odisti*. I doubt whether König is right here in thinking the Tetragrammaton part of the original text, but, for an instance of ם being treated as an abbreviation of the sacred Name, see *infra*, p. 662.

²This is the reading of the LXX.

here refers, the LXX has preserved the original readings which were lost in M.T.

Next, König instances the change of ideas as a cause of the corruption of the text. Thus baal was removed from texts for religious reasons (Hos. ii. 18 f.), and boscheth (shame) substituted, e.g. Jerubbaal became Jerubboscheth (2 Sam. xi. 21), where the LXX preserves the right reading (cp. Ishboscheth, 2 Sam. ii. 8, etc.). I draw special attention to this because I apprehend that some of the textual phenomena in Genesis, Numbers, and other books are due to scribal removals of the word "baal." And *Elohim* is used instead of the Tetragrammaton in certain parallel narratives and Psalms (pp. 76, 77). And on pages 77 f. he draws attention to the fact that, in 2 Samuel xxiii. 3, the Targum and the Septuagintal codex A have "Lord" for the Massoretic "God." Then (p. 78) König notes the mechanical destruction of MSS. through natural causes.

The inferences he draws as to the different periods of change in the text of the Old Testament will be considered with more advantage at a later stage, and accordingly, for the present, I omit them: but, again, the LXX is seen to have superior readings to the M.T. in this matter.

On page 83 we read: "'For the purpose of maintaining the conception of the Deity pure,' according to Geiger, p. 267, a verb for 'curse' was altered into 'bless,' when God was the object (1 Kings xxi. 10, 13; Job i. 5, 11; ii. 5, 9).¹ We must assent to this opinion," and he proceeds to give his reasons. "The tradition as to the cases enumerated in section 11, 1 as to the corrections of the scribes² is to be regarded as in

¹In Job i. 5 the LXX has *κακα ἐνοησαν*, in 11 Chrysostom read *βλασφημησαι*; in ii. 9 the ordinary LXX has *εἶπον τι ῥημα εἰς κυριον*; while 161 and the margin of 248 offer *καταρασαι τον θεον*.

²*Supra*, p. 632.

large part well founded" (*ibid.*). "We must doubtless assume with the Talmud that Jonathan, the grandson of Moses, was turned into a grandson of Manasseh (Judges xviii. 30),¹ in order that a grandson of the lawgiver might not already appear as a minister of an idol" (p. 84). "We probably have an alteration of the text directed against the Egyptian Jews in Isaiah xix. 18b," and accordingly König accepts החרם "sun," which is read by 16 MSS., Symmachus, Vulg., Talmud, Targum, and other authorities for החרם "destruction."

Thus far the Einleitung. Since it was written, the Nash papyrus has been discovered; and accordingly, in "Die moderne Pentateuchkritik," König takes it into account. He attributes it to the first century of the Christian era, and details the peculiarities of its text in *the Decalogue*. Then he writes: "What results from it for the history of the text, particularly for the relative authority of the MT and the LXX?"

"Well, the variations of this old copy of the Decalogue as compared with the MT only remind us once more that the Hebrew O. T., even after the commencement of its canonisation, was often copied with variants. We know this from the existence of differences between the Palestinian and Babylonian texts, as, e.g., the well-known St. Petersburg codex of the Prophets of 916 differs in the Book of Ezekiel in at least sixteen passages so as to affect the meaning" (pp. 34 f.). We have already seen that the number of textual variants is very much greater than might be thought from this remark, and that in chapter xl. of Ezekiel alone the single MS. K 150 presents numerous variations. Then König proceeds to weigh the relationship of the papyrus and the LXX, and unfortunately falls into a grave error.

¹ Vulg. Lat. and some MSS. of the LXX "Moses."

In considering this question regard must be paid to points he has omitted. To Deuteronomy vi. 4 the papyrus prefixes [ואלה החקן ים והמשפטים אשר צוה משה את [בני ישראל] במדבר בצאתם מארץ מצרים] "and these are the statutes and the judgments which Moses commanded the children of Israel in the wilderness when they went forth from the land of Egypt." This is the reading of B* (vid)N M(mg)o gn pt svz(txt) fi u and all the daughter versions extant in this passage (Arm Boh Sah Eth Lat). Other Septuagintal authorities have *Lord* (God) for Moses;¹ and, according to the note in v, this was the reading of O', i.e. a Hexaplar copy.² And at the end of vi. 4 it adds the word הוא, represented by ἐστίν in all our Septuagintal authorities.

Of these facts König breathes no syllable in his discussion of the resemblances of the papyrus to the LXX (pp. 34 f.). Yet they are of very great and indeed vital importance. Here is half a verse that is absent from every other Hebrew text found in this oldest Hebrew MS. of the Bible, and in presenting this, it supports the Septuagint.³ And in the verse which of all others is typical of Judaism it has an additional word. In this it is supported not only by the LXX but by the Syriac and the Vulgate. If such variants as these were current in Hebrew MSS. as late as the first century of the Christian era,

¹ It should be mentioned that B* F* omit "in the desert." Other Septuagintal variants in this passage are immaterial for our present purpose.

² See my "Studies in the Septuagintal Texts of Leviticus," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1913.

³ I believe this half verse to be a mere gloss that has crept into the Egyptian text. Its importance lies in showing how far the line of transmission which has resulted in M.T. was from having secured general recognition at the period when the papyrus was written.

it is evident that the text was very far from being standardized.¹

After this section had been drafted, Dr. John Skinner's "Divine Names in Genesis" was published. On page 144, in discussing fifteen variants of the Peshitta (Syriac) from the Massoretic text of the Divine appellations in Genesis, he writes: "If these be characteristics of a Hebrew text of the first or second century, we must of course admit that the official recension had not then obtained the exclusive ascendancy which it secured at a later time." What would he say of the facts to which attention has been drawn above?

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE VULGATE FOR TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

The next question that bears on the condition of the Masoretic text is the testimony of the Vulgate. König treats of this on pages 126 f. of his *Einleitung*, but in order to understand how he reached his conclusions it is necessary to explain the basis of his discussion. In 1875 W. Nowack published an investigation entitled "Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Textkritik." König relies entirely on this for his facts and appears to have made no independent study of the Vulgate. He accepts Nowack's conclusions with certain modifications that are unfavorable to Jerome's text. Thus Nowack had argued that an agreement of the Vulgate and a Targum pointed to a different Hebrew text, but König suggests that it may mean only that both were influenced by Jewish interpretations, Jerome having learned from his Jew-

¹ It may be noticed that the variant of the Nash papyrus in Ex. xx. 11 *וַיִּשָׁן* where M.T. reads the termination *-éhu* shows how easily such changes could creep in, and invalidates the argument based on the use of this termination in "P" on p. 229 of König's *Einleitung*.

ish teachers.¹ Further Nowack was of opinion that independent elements in Jerome's rendering represented a different text which was sometimes preferable to the Massoretic. He instanced Leviticus xxv. 33, where the Vulgate rightly reads: "if they shall *not* have been redeemed," and Numbers xxxii. 17, where the Vulgate has $\text{דַּשְׁמִחַ$ for $\text{דַּשְׁחַ$. (This latter is erroneously said in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* to be also the reading of the LXX, which renders *προφυλακην*.) On this, König (Einleitung, p. 127) wrote: "While the entirely independent elements in Jerome's rendering must be taken into account in the investigation of the original text, and in part like the שָׁב Lev. xxv. 30 [*sic* H. M. W.] are beyond doubt, yet in other passages they result from Jerome's methods of translation or — and Nowack himself mentions this as a pos-

¹ König writes (Einleitung, p. 127): "Es ist eine Frage für sich, inwieweit den von Hieron. benützten griech. Versionen einst ein hbr. Text entsprochen hat; die Zusammenstimmung des Hieron. mit diesen Versionen verändert nicht die Wage zu Gunsten der Bejahung jener Frage." I confess that my own impression is that in the Pentateuch what (rightly or wrongly) passes for Jerome sometimes represents a pre-Hexaplar authority of the first rank preserving a text that is nearer alike to the autograph of the Law and to the original text of the Septuagint than either the Massoretic text or current Greek copies. H. P. Smith (Presbyterian and Reformed Review, April, 1891, p. 225) writes: "Where no variation is registered [*sc.* in the MSS. of the Vulgate] we may suppose that we have Jerome's language—allowed by him to stand in some cases from the old version. If this agrees with the LXX rather than the Hebrew, we may still suspect its independence." But Smith had first weeded out Old Latin elements and he is speaking especially of the books of Samuel, which have a different textual history. I think with him that there are readings where Jerome and the LXX agreed independently, but it will appear in the course of the following investigation that in using a printed Vulgate in the Pentateuch we are often using the text that is nearest of all to the original. It will be noted that Smith expressly says that Jerome's language was "allowed by him to stand in some cases from the old version."

sibility (p. 39) — an oversight of his (in reading his Hebrew).” So even on his own assumptions König is compelled to admit some superior readings in the Vulgate.

But, in fact, Nowack's investigation cannot be supported in the light of the knowledge of to-day. A fresh examination will be necessary when the new edition of the Vulgate which is being prepared by the Benedictines is given to the world. Meanwhile, however, it is possible to do much to vindicate the immense importance of the text treated by Nowack and König as the Vulgate for the textual criticism of the Pentateuch, and to point to some of the weaknesses in Nowack's investigation. This text is the edition of Heyse and Tischendorf which was used by Nowack. In reality, while we do not know how far it may prove to represent Jerome's original text, any readings it may display that are *superior* to our Hebrew have an independent value, and the question of their ultimate derivation does not affect the gain to the textual criticism of the Hebrew Pentateuch. In cases like this the textual critic is entitled to apply Molière's principle, “Je prends mon bien où je le retrouve.” At the same time it is necessary to consider somewhat further what is known about this text. It is founded on a collation of the codex Amiatinus by Heyse, and this codex is a very excellent witness to Jerome's text. Now Professor H. P. Smith published an article on “The Value of the Vulgate Old Testament for Textual Criticism” in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for April, 1891 (pp. 216-234). It is based on an examination of the text of First Samuel, which had a very different history from the text of the Pentateuch. In the course of this article he writes: “The two elements of which the current Vulgate is composed have very different sources and testify to different things. The readings which come

from the Old Latin, come from the Septuagint. Only those which belong properly to the Vulgate testify what Jerome read in his Hebrew text" (p. 219). "*The collation of the Amiatinus by Heyse is generally acknowledged to be very imperfect*" (p. 220, note, my italics). His conclusions should also be cited:—

"1. Jerome's Hebrew Bible was of the same general type with ours. It is clear that at some period subsequent to the work of the Seventy a single copy of the Old Testament was adopted as authentic by the Synagogue. This was probably before the time of Jerome, for his copy in its general features agrees with our Hebrew text.

"2. Nevertheless the Hebrew of Jerome was not yet settled in all points in the stereotyped form to which it was brought by the Massorettes. In a number of cases his copy has preserved a variant reading. Even where it simply shows agreement with the Greek it is not always dependent upon it. It has in a number of cases readings agreeing with the Syriac where the derivation of one from the other is unlikely. It shows besides a number of variants in which it stands alone. A considerable proportion of these as well as of those in which the Vulgate corroborates the testimony of the other versions are, on internal evidence, to be preferred to those of the Hebrew.

"3. While the results of the collation of the Vulgate cannot be compared in importance with those gained from the Septuagint, yet they are sufficient to enable us to say that for a really critical text the Vulgate is an indispensable authority. In order to its adequate use, however, it must itself first be published in a critical edition" (p. 234).

In considering this judgment, and also many current estimates, it must always be borne in mind that Jerome may

have followed different methods in different books. The Prologus galeatus relates primarily to the books of Samuel and Kings *only*, and the known divergence of the Septuagint from the Hebrew text in those books may have led him to do more of actual translating from the Hebrew there than elsewhere. It was in this that he wrote "Quamquam mihi omnino concius non sim, mutasse me quippiam de hebraica veritate." In spite of this, and the similar protests in the preface to the Pentateuch and elsewhere, it is clear that he often adopted the Old Latin. G. Hoberg, in his "De Sancti Hieronymi ratione interpretandi," has given us an admirable account of Jerome's opinions and methods. He writes (p. 13): "Populus Christianus veteri latina translatione uti consueverat, ob eam rem ne res offensæ esset, Hieronymus non dubitavit permulta ex septuaginta sive ex veteri versione latina retinere idque tantum quantum fieri potuit. Quæ cura tanta fuit, ut diceret se, 'novum opus in vetere opere cudere.' Præf in 1. Paralip. XXVIII 1324 sq., 'Neque enim nova sic cudimus, ut vetera destruamus.' Præf in II. Salom XXVIII 1243 sq. Ex quibus efficitur Hieronymum magnam dedisse operam, ut nova interpretatio non solum simillima esset bibliis Hebraicis, sed etiam ea quæ in veteri justa essent, contineret asservaretque." And again (p. 14): "Singulariter biblia latina, quorum dignitas longo usu sancta erat, pie et religiose observavit et coluit." An examination of the parallels between the Old Latin of Daniel and Jerome's version adduced on pages 34-36 shows that Jerome appropriated a great deal from the former, and fully confirms Hoberg's judgment "multa versionis veteris in Hieronymi versione inesse."

Hitherto I have spoken of the Old Latin; but, in fact, nobody knows whether there was only one Old Latin translation from the Septuagint or more. In the time of Jerome it

was said that there were as many texts as copies; and though this, and similar statements, probably contain some exaggeration, yet they call for some attention. I have not found any great resemblance between the Vulgate and the Lyons Hephateuch in the passages I have had to examine, but in view of the diversity of the Old Latin texts this does not conclude the matter. I have often had to note the resemblance between the Vulgate text and particular Septuagintal authorities (m, bw, f, the Ethiopic may be mentioned),¹ and of course the use of Old Latin texts by Jerome may be the cause of this.

To-day it is possible to urge three great lines of argument in favor of the Vulgate that were unknown to Nowack and König; and, in addition, an examination of passages on which Nowack relies in the light of what is now known of the history of the Massoretic text usually leads to different conclusions from those he reached. The three great lines of argument are as follows:—

1. It frequently happens that where Jerome omits words and phrases that are present in our Hebrew he has the support of one or more extant Hebrew MSS. There can therefore be no question of his having been guilty of carelessness or abbreviation. For instance, in xliii. 3, K 102, 170, the Vulg D m n and the Ethiopic omit "saying"; in i. 28, the Vulgate has *et ait*, and the words "God to them" are omitted in a printed Talmud, while "God" is wanting in K 2, 109, 150 a printed Mishna and K 665, a MS. prayer book: K 125 has "saying" for the whole phrase. In xxx. 22b, K 170, 185, the Vulgate, e, n, and Chrysostom omit *Elohim*.² as do K 13, the Vulgate D h c₂ dt f Sah Eth and Chr in xxxv.

¹ See *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1913, pp. 283-286; July, 1914, pp. 466-472.

² K 109 misplaces this word.

10. In Numbers xv. 23 the Vulgate omits the Tetragrammaton twice, and is supported in the first instance by K 69, 109 ("insignis in re critica usus" according to de Rossi) and in the second by K 80, 109. In Genesis xxxv. 7 the original reading of R 18 supports the Vulgate and other ancient authorities in omitting "God of" before Bethel; in xlii. 13 "to-day" was originally lacking in R 23 and is not in the Vulgate; in xlv. 28 "Israel" was not written by the first hand of R 2 and is omitted by the Vulgate: in xlii. 1, R 10 and the Vulgate omit "Jacob" after "said"; in xxxiv. 13 "Hamor" was omitted by the first hand of R 500 HP 25 and the Vulgate; in xxxvi. 39 "Son of Achbor" is omitted by K 80 R 562 Sam Vulg. In many of these cases there are other ancient authorities to support the Vulgate's readings. On the other hand, the Vulgate is supported by K 69, 109 in inserting the Tetragrammaton in Genesis xv. 9. In Exodus vi. 2 for "God" R 476, 592 the Vulgate and other ancient authorities have "LORD." I have made no special search for instances of the Vulgate being supported by Hebrew MSS. because I do not think the time is ripe for such an inquiry having regard to the projected new edition of the version, but I recall the fact that K 1 alone supports the Vulgate in 88 variants in the Pentateuch.

2. There are some differences between the Vulgate and our Hebrew which are so extensive as to be recensional. Pope has referred to some of these on page 385 of his article in the *Irish Theological Quarterly* for October, 1913.¹ Others

¹ It should be said at once that Skinner (*Divine Names*, pp. 281-288) has failed in his attempt to answer Pope. When he contends that in the *Liber Hebraicarum Quæstionum in Genesim* Jerome is translating from the Greek he overlooks the fact that in two of the passages cited by Pope (Gen. xvii. 4; xxii. 2) Jerome's reading is not found in any Septuagintal authority whatever. So much for Skinner's contentions that Pope "has fallen

will come before us hereafter. For the moment I cite the omission of Genesis xlix. 32 as an example. This is mentioned, but not discussed at length, by Nowack.

3. The readings of the Vulgate sometimes confirm the conjectures of modern scholars, as in the case of Numbers xii. 1, cited above (p. 604).

I turn, therefore, to examine some of the arguments used against the Vulgate in the light of our present knowledge. König, following Nowack, says of Jerome that he "condensed diffuse passages [Darstellungen, properly presentations] (Lev. v. 22 f., etc.)." (Einleitung, p. 126; Nowack, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 20.) I take the cases cited.

In Leviticus v. 23-24 the Vulgate (vi. 4, 5) reads: "he shall restore all about which he swore falsely in full," etc. Thus it omits "that which he took by robbery, or the thing which he hath gotten by oppression, or the deposit which was committed to him, or the lost thing which he found, or." In into" a "gross blunder," and that "the only doubtful question is whether he [*sc.* Jerome] is citing the Old Latin version of the LXX or translating from the LXX itself" (p. 284). As to the passages adduced by Pope to show that Jerome in the Vulgate has a shorter text, it appears that Skinner has read them. His remarks are as follows: "It would not be right to express a confident judgment without more careful study than I can afford to make of the subject; but my strong impression is that, *while textual differences exist* [my italics, H. M. W.], the chief cause of variation between the Vulgate and the M.T. is condensed paraphrase in translation. And even if the textual difference should be greater than I take it to be, the passages cited are such as, from their technicality and redundancy, were peculiarly liable to errors of transcription." One of these passages (Ex. xxx.) is treated below, and Skinner is now given the means of making more careful study. He admits textual differences, and the discussion that follows will enable the reader to see how extensive these sometimes are. I do not believe in his theory of condensed paraphrase, which is admittedly only an impression, unsupported by facts or arguments and confessedly based on the absence of careful study.

omitting the last "or" it has the support of the LXX and K 129, a Hebrew MS. Now could so great a difference be reasonably attributed to any legitimate or probable method of *translation* consonant with Jerome's avowed principles? Must we not admit that the overwhelming probability is that either this is not Jerome but an Old Latin passage, or else that the words were not in the text he found before him? If we examine the Massoretic text as it will be with these words removed, we find that it reads perfectly without them. The sense is already given by v. 21 f. (vi. 2 f.), and the passage has all the appearance alike in phraseology and contents of an amplificatory gloss. We cannot tell the origin of this variant on our present materials, but I do not think it can reasonably be attributed to compression by Jerome. K 103 omits from ל in verse 3 to וְשֵׁן in verse 6, but this is probably due to homoioteleuton, caused by the recurrence of the last word.

Leviticus ii. 8 reads: "And thou shalt bring the meal offering that is made of these things unto the Lord: and it shall be presented unto the priest and he shall bring it unto the altar. 9 And the priest shall take up," etc. The Vulgate omits "that is made of these things." Here the omission leaves us with a better text and appears to be right. It apparently also read "it" for "the meal offering," and in the latter part of the verse has "thou shalt present to the priest and he shall bring it and take up," etc. There are here three points. "Thou shalt present it" for "it shall be presented." This runs more smoothly, and in view of what we have learnt of abbreviations in Hebrew MSS. is certainly no improbable reading. Then we have to note the omissions of "to the altar" and (ver. 9) "the priest." In the latter the Vulgate is supported by c gn and Arm, and I think both phrases should be attributed to glossators.

The Massoretic text of Leviticus v. 5¹ has: "And it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these that he shall confess that wherein he hath sinned." Verse 7 ends with the words "and he shall be guilty in one of these." The first half of the Massoretic verse 5 is lacking in the Vulgate, but it was also lacking in the LXX and was inserted by Origen. It is found under the asterisk in Gck gn and w. It is also wanting in K 95. When we look at it, we find that its last eleven letters are identical with the last eleven letters of verse 4. To anybody who has experience in textual work, it will therefore appear certain that either the words were omitted from the Hebrew of the Vulgate through homoioteleuton, or else that they have come into the text by accident. Consider the text "or if any one swear," etc., "and knoweth it, and is guilty in one of these, and it shall be if he is guilty in one of these, then," etc. Anybody can judge for himself whether the words "and it shall be if he is guilty in one of these" are or are not likely to be original. Then in verse 6 the Massoretic text reads: "and he shall bring his guilt offering to the Lord for his sin which he hath sinned, a female from the flock, a lamb or a goat, for a sin offering; and the priest shall make atonement for him from his sin." The Lyons Heptateuch has *et adtulerit pro his quæ neglexerit Deo, pro delicto quo deliquit, feminam de ovibus agnam, aut capellam ex capris pro delicto. Et propitiavit pro ea sacerdos pro delicto, et remittetur e peccatum.* Now in the Vulgate the words "his guilt offering unto the Lord for his sin which he hath sinned,"² and also "for a sin offering," are lacking; and, instead of "for him as concerning his sin," we find "for it and for his sin." In judging this question several facts must be borne

¹ Lyons Heptateuch: "Et retulerit delictum, pro quibus deliquit in eo super id ipsum."

² K 75 omits "he hath sinned."

in mind. No modern writer can make anything out of the distinction between sin offering and guilt offering in the Massoretic text, and it seems certain that the original distinction has been obscured in the course of transmission. When, therefore, our texts differ, it is impossible to form any secure judgment without a complete study of the whole question in the light of all the textual evidence. At present all we can say is that the data of the Massoretic text in this matter are unreliable. It *may* be that the Vulgate is wrong; but, as at present advised, I do not believe that any offering was described as both a guilt offering and a sin offering in the same verse by the original author. Both descriptions *may* be glosses; but I think one of them must be not merely a gloss, but an erroneous gloss.

Next, we have to observe that other authorities present us with an alternative text. The Sam and LXX have at the end "and the priest shall make atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned and he shall be forgiven," as in iv. 25. In view of the many other similar phrases in these chapters, I am of opinion that, with the possible exception of the words "that he hath sinned," this is the original — or at any rate an earlier — text.¹ But if so, then the Vulgate must be right in its earlier omission of the words "for his sin which he sinned," which are identical with this termination, and are in fact omitted in m and the Würzburg palimpsest of the Old Latin. I think that these words have come into the Massoretic text by accident from the original phrase at the end of the verse. Here, then, Jerome appears to me to have been right. Lastly, we must remark that his translation "for it and for his sin" appears to go back to an earlier text

¹After writing this I found that these words were wanting in the Lyons Heptateuch (cited above).

than the Massoretic, though possibly it represents in part an attempt to render what was already corrupt. "For his sin" is the reading of the Sam and LXX, and accordingly there seems no reason to doubt that Jerome found it. On the whole, therefore, I am of opinion that, if this be Jerome's text, the evidence points to his having had before him a reading that was intermediate between the original LXX and the Massoretic, or else to his having partially corrected an Old Latin copy in the light of a Hebrew text.

In Leviticus xi. 37 the Massoretic text has "sowing seed which is to be sown," the Vulgate simply "seed." Here I find that Ryssel in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* suspects "sowing" of having come in by dittography. As a matter of fact it is lacking in A* the Sahidic, Ethiopic, and an Old Latin copy, i.e. in a number of pre-Hexaplar authorities. There is, therefore, no reason to suppose that Jerome had it in his text. The other words may easily have fallen out of Jerome's Hebrew original through homoioteleuton; but, personally, I think that they are more probably a gloss, like so many other of these unnecessary relative clauses.

Then in Leviticus xxv. 30 the Massoretic text, supported by the Lyons Heptateuch and the other Septuagintal authorities, reads "the house which is in the city which has (not) a wall," but Jerome has simply "the house." Anybody with any appreciation of literary style will see at once that the missing words are simply an inelegant gloss, and that Jerome here has the better text.

The same remark applies to Exodus ix. 3, where the Vulgate "upon thy field upon the horses," etc., is superior to the Massoretic "upon thy cattle which is in the field." The latter is clearly due to some unimaginative annotator who could not understand the statement that the hand of the LORD was

upon the field being explained by the horses, etc. How could a field be equivalent to animals? So he inserted the note that turned the more poetic phraseology of the original into the prosaic statement of the Massoretic text. We are not to suppose that Jerome, who did not shrink from enumerating the horses, the asses, the camels, the herds, and the flocks, would have omitted the word "cattle" had he found it. But this reading points to his having had before him a different and better text than our present Hebrew.

In Exodus xxx. 15 the Vulgate omits "when they give the offering of the Lord to make atonement for your souls" which are found in the Lyons Heptateuch. A comparison of verses 14 and 16 makes it probable that these words are a mere gloss, and that they were not in Jerome's Hebrew.

Then in verse 20 the Vulgate omits לָשֵׂרֵת "to minister," which is probably a gloss, and "they shall wash with water that they die not"; and in this it is unquestionably right. These words are also omitted in bw, and m lacks "they shall wash with water."¹ Jerome also omits "and they shall wash their hands and their feet" in verse 21 — again rightly.

MASSORETIC TEXT.

And Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and feet thereat; when they go into the tent of meeting *they shall wash with water they they die not*; or when they come near to the altar *to minister*, to burn an offering made by fire unto the Lord: *and they shall wash their hands and their feet* that they die not.

VULGATE.

And Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and feet thereat when they go into the tent of meeting or when they come near to the altar to burn *on it* an offering made by fire unto the Lord that they die not.

¹The note in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* stating that the words "that they die not" are absent from the LXX in verse 21 appears to be due to an oversight. They are also present in the Lyons Heptateuch, which supports the LXX and M.T. throughout.

Anybody who has had occasion to study the way in which glossators amplified the text will have no hesitation in deciding between the two, though the phrase "on it" in the Vulgate may be regarded as not original, i.e. either as having been present in the Hebrew copy but not in the autograph of the law, or else as being an explanatory insertion in the Latin either by the translator or by a later glossator. It should be added that the Vulgate text is strongly supported by the Hebrew of Exodus xl. 31 f.

In Exodus xii. 41 the Vulgate fails to repeat the 430 years of the last verse. I think that here again, it probably represents a shorter text, and that the 430 years are the addition of a glossator who read as "end" a Hebrew text that was intended to convey "their end."

On the other hand, in xxiii. 16 Jerome appears to omit "ingathering," and similarly in xxxiv. 22. The latter case, however, seems to provide the solution. He renders "et solemnitatem, quando redeunte anni tempore cuncta conduntur."¹ It seems clear that he took *quando cuncta conduntur* to be equivalent to *הַיְדֻשׁ*, which, with his defective grammatical knowledge, he may not have fully understood. If that be so, perhaps his rendering of the earlier text "*solemnitatem quoque in exitu anni, quando congregaveris omnes fruges tuas de agro*" was the best he could do. This is a case where, for whatever reason, his text in its present form is clearly inferior to the Massoretic Hebrew.

In all the following passages of Numbers the Lyons Heptateuch supports the LXX, except for the important variant noted in xv. 11 ff.

¹ In xxxiv. 22 Lyons Hept renders *diem sollemnem conventionis medio anno* where *conventionis* corresponds to *הַיְדֻשׁ*. The earlier passage is missing in this MS.

In Numbers i. 5 the Vulgate has "and these are their names," for "and these are the names of the men that shall stand with you." I think this text the more original.

In v. 4 it omits "so did the children of Israel," and, in view of the words "and the children of Israel did so," at the beginning of the verse, it cannot be doubted that the reading of the Vulgate is here correct. In vii. 1 "and had anointed them and sanctified them" is wanting in the Vulgate and HP. 71. Coming after "and had anointed it and sanctified it and all the furniture thereof," etc., it is clearly a glossator's addition.

The last two passages to be considered in this connection are perhaps the most interesting of all. In Numbers xxxi. 23 Jerome had a text that lacked a single "and." He rendered what he had before him correctly, and in so doing exposed a gloss. Here are the two texts side by side, arranged so as to show the differences at a glance:—

MASSORETIC TEXT.

Every thing that may abide the fire, ye shall make to go through the fire and it shall be clean: however (it) shall be purified with the water of separation; and all that abideth not the fire *ye shall make to go through the water.*

VULGATE.

Every thing that may abide the fire shall be purged by fire (= ye shall make to go through the fire and it shall be clean): however (there) shall be purified with the water of separation all that abideth not the fire.

According to our Hebrew, both fire and the water were necessary in the first case. According to Jerome's text, the water was to be used only in the second instance, and the concluding words are a gloss introduced to make sense after the "and" had come in. That the water was not originally intended to be used in the first case is proved by the fact that the text expressly says that the firing is to result in the article's being clean, thereby precluding the necessity for the use

of the water; also by the use of "however." Here, therefore, Jerome is right.

I now come to the most far-reaching case of all—Numbers xv. 11–16. I begin by setting out the two texts side by side:—

MASSORETIC TEXT.

11 Thus shall it be done for each bullock, or for each ram, or for each of the he-lambs, or of the kids 12 According to the number that ye shall do, so shall ye do to every one according to their number. 13 Every native shall do thus these things for offering a fire offering for a sweet savour unto the LORD. 14 And if a stranger sojourn with you, or whosoever be among you through your generations, and will do a fire-offering of a sweet savour unto the Lord; as ye do so he shall do. 15 The Assembly, there shall be one statute for you and for the stranger that sojourneth, a statute for ever throughout your generations: as ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord. 16 One law and one ordinance shall be for you, and for the stranger that sojourneth with you.

VULGATE.

11 Thus shalt thou¹ do 12 for each bullock and ram and he-lamb and kid. 13 Both natives and strangers 14 Shall offer offerings made by fire (? Lat *sacrificia*) by the same rite. 15 One law and one ordinance shall be for you and the strangers that sojourn in the land (*adventis terrae*).

It will be noted at once that, whatever may be right, the Massoretic text, as it stands, is certainly wrong, for no intelligible sense can be obtained from verse 15. It is, however, necessary to add the texts of certain Septuagintal authorities (bw for ver. 14b–16, m for the whole passage, and the Old Latin for ver. 11–13) before discussing the details.

¹ Variant "ye" according to Vercellone, supported by the Vulgate MSS. A B C D E F G K L R S T U V.

Text of bw.

14b as ye do thus shall do the assembly for the Lord. 15 **As** ye are so shall the stranger be before the Lord. 16 One law and one ordinance shall be for you and for the stranger that sojourneth with you.

Text of m.

11 Thus shall he [so G x a, Syr]¹ do for each bullock or for each ram or for each of the he-lambs or the kids.

12 According to the number that ye shall do.

13 Every native shall do thus such things for offering fire offerings for a sweet savour unto the Lord.

14 And if a stranger sojourn among you in your land or [c Arm omit] whosoever be among you through your generations [Arm Eth also omit "and"] will do a fire offering a sweet savour to the Lord as ye shall do [Ethc joins m in omitting the rest of the verse].

15 One statute shall there be for you and for the strangers that sojourn among you a statute for ever throughout your generations [omitting the rest of the Massoretic 15 and the whole of the Massoretic 16].

Text of Old Latin.

11 Thus shall ye do for each bullock or for each ram or lamb of the sheep or of the goats.

12 According to the number ye shall do thus.

13 And ye shall offer such fruits (= καρπώματα = fire offerings) a sweet savour to the Lord.

The other variants of the Old Latin are less important.

If now we take the points singly, we shall be better able to form an opinion. Verse 11 of the Massoretic text is identical with 11 and 12 of the Vulgate, except that the latter, in accordance with Latin idiom, is able to give the force of the repeated "each" by *singulis*, and that it read "shalt do" for "shall be done." In this it has the support of K 69 (a Hebrew MS.), almost all the Septuagintal authorities, and the Syriac (except that the latter reads the plural). In Hebrew it involves only the change of a single letter, and the Massoretic text is very awkward. Probably therefore it is correct.

¹LXX generally "shalt thou."

Verse 12 of the Hebrew is altogether wanting in the Vulgate. The Old Latin text may be due to omission through homoioteleuton, caused by the repeated *οὕτως* "thus," but this does not apply to the text of m. When we examine the verse we find that it is merely a commentary on the repeated "each" of verse 11: and the testimony of m suggests that it reached its present form in two stages. Apparently somebody who did not think the "each" clear enough first inserted a note "according to the number that ye shall do," and then, to make assurance doubly sure, another commentator explained with the words "so shall ye do every one according to their number."

Omitting the intervening verses for the present, I come to the Massoretic 14b, 15, and 16. With the varying texts of m and bw before us, it is difficult to doubt that the Massoretic Hebrew is compounded of these two readings. That "the assembly" in the Massoretic text makes no sense is beyond dispute. Of the two variants represented by the rest of 15a and 16, the latter is more probably original, — not merely because it is read by the better authorities, but also because the incomplete phrase "the stranger that sojourneth" is strongly suggestive of a commentator, and so is "a statute for ever throughout your generations."¹ Then it becomes evident that "as ye do so shall do the assembly" (M.T. 14b, 15), "as ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord" (M.T. and bw 15b), "as ye shall do" (m 14b), "as ye do, thus shall do the assembly for the Lord" (bw 14b), are in some way or other variants of one and the same phrase. I think that, whatever the phrase originally was, we may safely conclude,

¹ Of course verse 16 may itself be a gloss. It is very difficult in dealing with these sentences that add nothing to the sense to be certain whether anything is original. The whole meaning of M.T. verses 13-16 is expressed by Vulg. 13, 14.

from the context: (1) that "the assembly" is an accidental corruption; and (2) that the original text was concerned with the stranger's *offering*, not with the general "so shall he be before the Lord," which looks like an explanation. Therefore I think that the Vulgate probably represents the meaning of the original Hebrew quite correctly, but at this point we must look back to the earlier part of 14.

The words "whosoever be among you through your generations" appear to be a gloss on what precedes; for (1) they merely amplify "if a stranger sojourn," etc., (2) the introductory "or" is omitted by c and the Armenian, (3) the subsequent "and" is wanting in the Armenian and Ethiopic, and (4) there is no trace of them in our Vulgate. It must be remembered that there was a time when ו and ו were written very similarly and our וְעַשֶׂה would be indistinguishable from וְעַשֶׂה. Let us remove the words and read 13 and 14 in the text of m and Eth^c.

"Every native shall do thus the things for offering [omitted by K 18] fire offerings for a sweet savour unto the Lord and if a stranger sojourn ["among you" — misplaced in a₂ Arm — probably a gloss] in your land he shall do a fire offering a sweet savour to the Lord as ye shall do." This is not so very far — allowing for some paraphrase in the Latin rendering — from the Vulgate "Both natives and strangers shall offer fire-offerings by the same rite." I think we should probably infer that the "sweet savour unto the Lord" was unknown to the Latin translator in both occurrences,¹ but that otherwise the text was what we have now reached with the possible omission of "these things" to the end of verse 13. It would seem therefore that the original text at the end

¹ In verse 13 אֵשֶׁה is omitted by K 69, 158 and נִחַח by K 104: in verse 14 K 128 omits נִחַח. K 107 omits the whole of verse 13.

of that verse was m's "as ye shall do"; that the insertion of the gloss in the earlier part of the verse, and the consequent reading of "he shall do," made this unintelligible; and that we owe our multitude of variants and inflated Hebrew text largely to the endeavors to make sense of this. The earliest text probably ran somewhat as follows: "(Every) native shall do thus a fire offering and if a stranger sojourn in your land he shall do a fire offering as ye do."

One of the attempts at explanation was the gloss "he shall do"; perhaps "the assembly" was another marginal note introduced to elucidate the "ye shall do," thus: "If a stranger sojourn . . . and will do," etc., "as ye, the assembly, shall do, there shall be one statute." The Latin text, therefore, appears to me to be infinitely preferable, but I find it hard to believe that we have here a genuine translation by Jerome from a Hebrew MS. Rather would it seem to be an admirable pre-Hexaplar reading of the Old Latin, which has either been incorporated by Jerome (perhaps with some slight stylistic touches) or has ousted his work from the current text of the Vulgate.

If we sum up these passages, we find that, in the great majority of cases, the Vulgate presents a text that is superior to the Massoretic. In Leviticus ii. 8 (partly); v. 5, 6; Exodus xxx. 19-21; Numbers vii. 1; xv. 11-16, there is evidence to suggest that the Vulgate is, for whatever reason, giving us readings of the pre-Hexaplar Septuagint, though there is nothing to show whether we have Jerome's text before us in these cases. In Leviticus xi. 37 there is Septuagintal corroboration in part; but, on the whole, this may perhaps be attributed to the Hebrew before Jerome. In the other cases where the Vulgate exposes short glosses without any Septuagintal corroboration (Lev. ii. 8 (that is made of these things); xxv.

30; Ex. ix. 3; xxx. 15, 20 (to minister); xii. 41; Num. i. 5; v. 4; xxxi. 23) there seems no reason to doubt that Jerome may have had before him a superior Hebrew text. We have seen that there are cases where Vulgate omissions are upheld by Hebrew MSS. that are still extant; and the choice in all cases where the reading of the Vulgate is manifestly superior to the Massoretic and all our existing Septuagintal authorities lies between attributing them to Jerome's Hebrew and believing that the Vulgate as printed has in these instances retained Old Latin readings that are otherwise unknown. This is perhaps likely in such a case as Leviticus v. 23 f., but will scarcely be true of all the short glosses.

Another indictment by Nowack (*op. cit.*, p. 19) and König (Einleitung, p. 126) is that Jerome often substituted pronouns for substantives. We have already seen that glossators have inserted subjects and objects in our Hebrew text, and an examination of the passages cited in the light of this fact and of what we know of Hebrew MSS. is favorable to the Vulgate text. In Exodus ii. 1-2 Vulg LXX omit "the woman," reading "and she" (Vulgate *quæ*). In verse 15 the Vulgate has "and he (*qui*) fled" for "And Moses fled." In v. 23 the Vulgate and Chrysostom have "them" for the second "thy people." In view of the omission of final ם in old Hebrew MSS., there seems no reason to doubt that this reading is correct, and that "thy people" is the addition of a glossator who misread his Hebrew, and inserted the explanatory phrase in the light of its previous occurrence. In all these cases the Vulgate appears to me to be right. In ix. 3 Jerome has "my hand" for "hand of the Lord." Clearly both represent יד, which in the one case was treated as יד, י being, as we have seen,¹ a common abbreviation for the Tetragram-

¹ *Supra*, p. 638.

maton. As Nowack and König accuse Jerome of harmonizing "when the person changed rapidly in Hebrew," it is noteworthy that here it is the Vulgate, and not the Massoretic reading, that involves the rapid change of person. In xiv. 25, for "against the Egyptians," which is omitted by p and the Ethiopic, Jerome has "against us," which seems better. Finally, in Daniel ix. 17 the Vulgate differs from the Massoretic text, which, however, appears on other evidence to be doubtful (see Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, *ad loc.*).

To what conclusions does our survey lead us? The Vulgate as printed is of extraordinary importance for detecting glosses; but, when allowance is made for these, and for readings that may be readily explained by the peculiarities of ancient Hebrew MSS., the number of readings in which it alone of ancient authorities has a different consonantal text from the Massoretic is very small. There are many passages where it joins one or more other versions or the Samaritan in consonantal readings that are undoubtedly different from, and often superior to, the Massoretic; and in such cases, where they are not due to corruption of Jerome's text, or to influence through his teachers, or his study of other versions, we may conclude that they were in his Hebrew. Where he really has a different consonantal text against all other witnesses it naturally claims careful consideration, and is sometimes of great value. So far as can be judged from the readings registered by Pope in the *Irish Theological Quarterly* for October, 1913 (pp. 387 f.), the new collation of the Vulgate seems likely to confirm this view, and to show that it stands alone in its consonantal text on comparatively rare occasions, but is free from many glosses found in all other authorities. This may be due to two causes.

Jerome seems to have had before him a Hebrew MS. which was relatively free from glosses that had affected many other witnesses, and he may often have used an early Latin copy where its differences from his Hebrew did not appear to affect the sense, thus preserving for us an earlier and purer text. But in many cases the relative excellence of our printed Vulgate is probably due to the fact that in many passages the Old Latin has ousted Jerome's work.

Since writing this section I have seen the preface (dated 1 November 1913) to Hetzenauer's new edition of the Vulgate (*Biblia Sacra Vulgatæ Editionis Ratisbon and Rome 1914*). He writes: "Volebam in appendice critica omnes differentias inter Vulgatam Clementinam atque textum Hebraicum et Græcum lectoribus proponere. Colligens autem variantes lectiones magno cum stupore cognovi, appendicem criticam plus spatii occupaturam esse quam ipsum textum sacrum. . . . Nam 'Hieronymus pro timida sua natura, inquit Cornill non satis energice manum immisit et tradita sæpe intacta reliquit, etiam ubi ea falsa esse cognovit'¹ ad offensionem populorum vitandam. In aliis vero partibus versionis suæ magnam sumpsit licentiam. Plura omisit, plura addidit, plura transposui, plura nimis libere vertit, opinionibus suis exegeticis ipsam versionem accommodavit." This fully confirms the views expressed above, and will doubtless be received by Nowack, König, Skinner, and all who have depended on them "magno cum stupore."

¹ He cites Cornill's *Einleitung*, 1913, p. 315=pp. 534 f. of the English translation, "Introduction to the Canonical Books of the O. T."