

ARTICLE V.

FIRST STEPS IN THE STUDY OF GLOSSING.

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

CONTINUOUS preoccupation with the problems of the Pentateuch has convinced me that in its present form the work contains an immense amount of commentary. Every investigation in which I engage reveals some aspect or other of this truth, but I do not think that any section of Biblical students have any adequate appreciation of it. I propose, therefore, in the present article to throw together a few notes supplementing my previous writings on the subject. My view is that all our extant texts of the Pentateuch contain a very great deal of verbiage, which is due to the incorporation of *variorum* notes in the text and to endeavors to edit it satisfactorily. It seems to me that the glossators worked in several ways. They endeavored to explain by inserting notes at suitable points, they amplified by incorporating material from other passages, they interpreted and collected laws, and they repeated and expanded. Further, I think that this was a continuous process, and that we have notes on notes incorporated in our texts. Let us take an instance of a passage that seems to me to bear on its face sufficient marks of its origin. Exodus vi. 12 is resumed by verse 30. Its true continuation is vii. 1. If we read the intervening passage we shall see that it consists of three elements: (1) a statement that God commissioned Moses and Aaron (ver. 13); (2) a passage (ver. 14-27) which, while itself bearing the marks

of later expansion, clearly represents a commentator's note identifying at a crucial point of the narrative the Aaron and Moses who are its heroes, and tracing the genealogy of the leading descendants of Israel till the point at which they come in; and (3) a short resumptive summary (ver. 28-30) of vi. 2-12, making it possible for the narrative to go on its way. Thus we have here annotation which has itself gone through further glossing.

The better to understand the ways of glossators, let us study the short passage relating the divine command as to the death of Moses, which occurs twice in our Massoretic text.

NUMBERS XXVII.

12 And the Lord *said* unto Moses, Get thee up unto this mount of the Abarim [fir Boh add of Jordan, LXX adds Mount Nebo], and behold [Vulg adds thence] the land [LXX adds Canaan] which *I have given* unto the children of Israel [LXX adds for a possession].

13 And thou shalt behold it, and *thou shalt be* gathered unto thy people [thou also, (ejsvz omit)], as *was gathered* Aaron thy brother [LXX adds in Mount Hor].

14 [As (כֹּאֲשֶׁר) ye rebelled against my word (Vulg. *offendistis me*) in the wilderness of Zin, in the strife of the congregation to sanctify me (Vulg. *nec sanctificare me voluistis*, LXX adds ye did not sanctify me) at the waters before their eyes. These are the waters of Meribah of (LXX in) Kadesh (f omits "these" to "Kadesh") in the wilderness of Zin].

DEUTERONOMY XXXII.

48 And the Lord *spake* unto Moses [ou this selfsame day, *saying*,]

49 Get thee up unto this mount of the Abarim [mount Nebo which is in the land of Moab (B Canaan) which is (LXX omits) over against Jericho;] and behold the land [of Canaan] which *I am giving* unto the children of Israel [for a possession (B omits)]:

50 [And die in the mount whither thou art going up] *and be* gathered unto thy people as [died] Aaron thy brother [in mount Hor (F*w omit) and] *was* gathered [unto his people].

51 [For that (עַל אֲשֶׁר) ye trespassed against me in the midst of the children of Israel in the waters of Meribah of Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin, for that (עַל אֲשֶׁר) ye did not sanctify me in the midst of the children of Israel.]

The comparison of these texts is of great value, because they are so obviously derived from a common basis; and it is at once evident that, for whatever reasons, this basis has led to two very different versions. It is indisputable that the main source of the discrepancies is to be found in heavy glossing. This appears from the following considerations:—

(a) In each of the two passages some of our authorities add obvious glosses that are lacking in others, e.g. the additions of the LXX and the Vulgate in Numbers *xvii. 12*.

(b) The subject matter of the surplusage is in some cases repugnant to the context. It is unnatural that any writer reporting a command given to Moses at the foot of this "Mount of the Abarim" should proceed to say to him that this is "Mount Nebo, which is in the land of Moab, which is over against Jericho." It is as if one should say to a Londoner, "Go from London, where you are at present, which is on the Thames, which is in England." But such phrases are precisely suitable to a commentary. The same remark applies to the qualifying "of Canaan" in the same verse (Deut. *xxxii. 49*).

(c) Other phrases that are peculiar to one of the passages amplify, resume, or explain what is found in the common basis. Thus in Numbers *xxvii. 13*, "And thou shalt behold it" merely resumes the earlier "behold the land"; "for a possession" in Deut. *xxxii. 49*, "in mount Hor" in verse 50, "on this selfsame day" (ver. 48) and "thou also" in Numbers *xxvii. 13* are amplifications, and the phrases about dying in Deuteronomy *xxxii. 50* explain those about being gathered unto one's people.

(d) The doubtful sense and grammar and the use of the cumbrous *כאשר* and *על אשר* clearly betray the glossator in the concluding verses, as do also the utter absence of any infor-

mation independent of Numbers xx. and the general nature of the expressions.

(e) "Saying" in Deuteronomy xxxii. 48 is a frequent gloss, equivalent to our punctuation.

This leaves us with two differences: in Numbers xxvii. 12 we have "said" and in Deuteronomy xxxii. 48 "spake," and later there is the variation between "which *I have given* unto the children of Israel" and "which *I am giving*." On the former of these it would be premature to express an opinion, the latter may be due to glossing or to variations in the transmission. If now we assume that the speech was originally, "Get thee up unto this mount of the Abarim, and behold the land (? which I am giving unto the children of Israel?), and thou shalt be gathered unto thy people like Aaron thy brother" (or "as was gathered Aaron thy brother"), we shall see that there have been vast possibilities for choking and increasing the Biblical text without in any way reëncoring its meaning, and, unhappily, with considerable loss of clearness and force.

It was noted above that the cumbrous על אישר helped to betray the glossator. If we look at the instances where this phrase occurs in the Pentateuch in the sense of "because," we shall find that there are only three outside the present passage. In two of these, reasons for its use are at once apparent. In Deuteronomy xxix. 24 the phrase is used in answer to the question על כן in the preceding verse, "For what did the Lord," etc.: "For that they deserted," etc. In Numbers xx. 24 the reason is that כִּי has already been used in the clause on which it depends, "for (כִּי) he shall not come into the land . . . for that ye rebelled." The third passage is Exodus xxxii. 35. Here the Massoretic text reads: "for that they made the calf which Aaron made." That is certainly wrong, and we are

not surprised to find that the Syriac and Targum have "they served" for "they made," while the Vulgate reads "pro reatu vituli," etc. It may be that Jerome's rendering goes back to a substantive in the construct state, but we cannot be sure of this.

It is apparent that the mere use of *על שם* is no sufficient proof of the existence of a gloss. At the same time the expression was sometimes used by glossators, and it is therefore natural to turn to some of the other instances in the historical books where it occurs, to see if there is any ground for using it as a clue to glossing. In 1 Samuel xxiv. 4 we read: "Then David arose, and cut off the skirt of Saul's robe privily. 5 And it came to pass afterward, that David's heart smote him, *for that he had cut off Saul's skirt,*" etc. Now the Septuagintal MS. HP 44 omits the italicized clause, and certainly it looks as if it might be due to a commentator who dotted the i's of his author. There are probably other passages where the same thing would hold true, but the absence of direct evidence makes it unwise to hazard a definite opinion at the present stage of textual studies. What should be said is that clauses that add nothing to the meaning save what is already present in the context must rest under suspicion.

From this I turn to some instances taken from the great repetition:—

EXODUS XXV.

2 Speak unto the children of Israel, that they take for me an offering; of every man whose heart maketh him willing ye shall take my offering. 3 *And this is the offering which ye shall take of them, gold and silver and brass, etc.*

EXODUS XXXV.

4 . . . This is the thing which the Lord commanded, saying, 5 Take ye from among you an offering unto the Lord: whosoever is of a willing heart let him bring it, the Lord's offering: gold, etc.

Certainly the comparison suggests that the italicized words in verse 3 are not original.

EXODUS XXV.

29 And thou shalt make the dishes thereof, and the spoons thereof, *and the flagons thereof, and the bowls thereof*, to pour out withal; of pure gold *shalt thou make them.*

EXODUS XXXVII.

16 And he made the vessels which were upon the table, the dishes thereof, *and the spoons thereof, and the bowls thereof*, and the flagons thereof to pour out withal, of pure gold.

Apart from the difference of order between the flagons and the bowls (and in this the Samaritan in xxv. agrees with the Massoretic order in xxxvii.) the words "shalt thou make them" are clearly shown to be a gloss. This is a common form of gloss, as witness the following comparison:—

EXODUS XXX.

1 And thou shalt make an altar to burn incense of acacia wood *shalt thou make it*; 2 a cubit, etc.

EXODUS XXXVII.

25 And he made an altar of incense of acacia wood; a cubit, etc.

Compare also xxviii. 15 with xxxix. 8.

On the whole, however, comparison of the great repetition with the earlier passage in the Massoretic text does little to increase our knowledge of the ways of glossators. The above instances have been cited because they provide an elementary introduction and confirm the testimony of other passages as to the textual history.

More interesting is the passage at the beginning of the repetition which deals with the sabbath law.

EXODUS XXXI.

13 (a) Verily ye shall keep my sabbaths; (a) for it is a sign between me and you throughout

EXODUS XXXV.

2 Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day *there shall be to you (an) holy (day),*

EXODUS XXXI.

your generations; (β) that ye may know that I am the Lord which sanctify you.

14 (b) And ye shall keep the **sabbath, (γ) for it is holy unto you; (1) he that profaneth it shall surely be put to death; (ii) for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from his people.**

15 (c) Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day (is) a sabbath of solemn rest, **holy to the Lord; (iii) whosoever doeth work in the sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death.**

EXODUS XXXV.

a sabbath of solemn rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death.

It is to be observed, in the first instance, that each of these passages is connected with matter not found in the other. Exodus xxxi. 16 f. deals with the sabbath covenant; xxxv. 2 contains a law, not found elsewhere, prohibiting the lighting of a fire on the sabbath day. Nevertheless, it must be clear that xxxi. 13-15 and xxxv. 2 are connected, and that there is some common basis. Once, however, we examine Exodus xxxi. carefully, some curious facts emerge. We see that it consists of three overlapping commands to keep the sabbath, three overlapping statements of the sanctions for violating it, and two reasons. For the sake of clearness it may be set out thus:—

- (a) Verily ye shall keep my sabbaths.
- (b) And ye shall keep the sabbath.
- (c) Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day is a sabbath of solemn rest, holy to the Lord.
 - (i) He that profaneth it shall surely be put to death.
 - (ii) For whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people.

(iii) Whosoever doeth work in the sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death.

(a) For it is a sign between you and me throughout your generations.

(β) That ye may know that I am the Lord which sanctify you.

It may be said at once that no legislator who knew his business ever composed laws in this style. Two thirds of this at least must be commentary. The later passage suggests that the author of Exodus xxxv. found before him verse 15 in a simpler form, and if that be so, (c) and (iii) alone contain the nucleus from which all this verbiage has arisen. What light do the Septuagintal texts throw on our problem? Very little: in verse 13 B omits the "for," suggesting that this word was added after "it is a sign," etc., had been taken into the text. In verse 14 the LXX generally reads (with variations): "for it is holy of the Lord unto you, he that profaneth it shall surely be put to death, every one who shall do work," but m has "for it is holy, he who shall do work," i.e. it has a shorter text, omitting (i) altogether: further, for "that soul shall be cut off from among his people," f has "and he shall surely die," and x omits "that soul." These variations are instructive as showing how the text has grown by gradual stages. But they have a further value. The phrases about being cut off have long presented a crux to interpreters. The fact is that the Biblical texts are not entirely consistent, and it is impossible to obtain an absolutely crisp and clear notion of the original meaning of the phrase by a collation of the passages in which it occurs. But if textual criticism suggests that it has often been introduced through the incorporation of notes, there is an obvious possibility that fresh investigations in the light of this science may lead to a

happier result. This in turn recalls the fact that there are other technical terms, such as "sin offering" and "trespass offering," about which the data of our present Pentateuch are conflicting; and it may be that in these cases, too, glossing is responsible for the obliteration of clear conceptions.

Lastly, we come to the comparison of xxxi. 15 and xxxv. 2 from the point of view of glossing, and the story is easy enough to read. The word "holy" occurs in different places in the two Hebrew texts, and it is omitted altogether in the Septuagintal MS. x. "There shall be to you" in xxxv. 2 is wanting in the earlier passage. "In the sabbath day" in xxxi. is "therein" in xxxv., and the LXX is divided between "in the sabbath day" and "in the seventh day." The part of the Hebrew verb "die" which is rendered "surely" in the English translation is omitted in the Septuagintal Bh* of Exodus xxxi. as well as in the Hebrew of xxxv. It may also be noted that in xxxv. 2 the LXX has "a rest, holy, a sabbath (or sabbaths), a rest to the Lord," the last "a rest to the Lord" being omitted by m. Clearly then an earlier text read something like this: "Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh [is] a sabbath (= rest) of rest (? to the Lord), he that doeth work (on it) shall die."

A familiar instance of a deuterograph is provided by the ten commandments of Exodus xx. 2-17; Deuteronomy v. 6-18. Neglecting cases where ׀ (and) appears in one of the texts and not in the other, we find the following instances of glosses: Deuteronomy twice (verses 12 and 16) adds the words "as the Lord thy God commanded thee." Twice we find clauses introduced by "in order that": viz. verse 14, "in order that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest like thee," a most obvious explanatory note; and verse 16, "and in order that it may be well with thee." Isolated amplifica-

tory glosses are: "thy ox and thy ass and all" before the word "cattle" in verse 14, as contrasted with Exodus xx. 10, and "his field" after "house of thy neighbor" in verse 18. A much more extensive note is to be found in verse 14: "And thou shalt remember that thou wert a slave in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee forth thence with a strong hand and an outstretched arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day"; and a similar remark applies to Exodus xx. 11, containing a corresponding but totally different sentence connecting the sabbath with the creation. This last verse is missing in HP 136, whether by some accident or through derivation from an earlier text it is impossible to say.

The laws of forbidden food in Leviticus xi. and Deuteronomy xiv. are parallel. I content myself with quoting short passages that are of great value for our present investigation:—

LEVITICUS XI.

9 These shall ye eat of all that are in the waters; whatsoever hath fins and scales [in the waters in the seas and in the rivers, them] shall ye eat.

10 And whatsoever hath not fins and scales [in the seas, and in the rivers of all that move on the waters, and of all the living creatures that are in the waters] (a) an abomination are they unto you.

11 (b) And an abomination shall they be unto you; ye shall not eat of their flesh, and their carcases ye shall have in abomination.

12 (c) Whatsoever hath no fins nor scales in the waters, that is an abomination unto you.

DEUTERONOMY XIV.

9 These shall ye eat of all that are in the waters: whatsoever hath fins and scales shall ye eat.

10 And whatsoever hath not fins and scales ye shall not eat; [it is unclean unto you].

The comparison here is sufficiently instructive. There is a mass of verbiage in Leviticus that is missing in Deuteronomy. First, there are the bracketed words in verse 9. It will be seen that they add nothing whatever to the sense and are probably a mere amplificatory gloss. In verse 10 the words "in the seas and in the rivers" are omitted by bw as well as by Deuteronomy. We then have no fewer than three statements that unclean fish are an abomination:—

- (a) An abomination are they unto you;
- (b) And an abomination shall they be unto you;
- (c) Whatsoever hath no fins nor scales in the waters that is an abomination unto you.

This cannot possibly be original. But (c) is omitted by bw and (b) by F*, while in (a) "unto you" is omitted by the whole LXX. Probably, therefore, the text of this passage originally ran thus:—

"These shall ye eat of all that are in the waters, whatsoever hath fins and scales; and (= but) whatsoever hath not fins and scales are an abomination; ye shall not eat of their flesh, and their carcasses ye shall have in abomination." (Note the chiasmic order "not eat: flesh:: carcasses: have in abomination." No glossator would write thus.) This text is clear and vigorous. All the rest is mere verbiage. Whether the words at the end of Deuteronomy xiv. 10 are original is more doubtful.

In this connection an interesting example of glossing in the same chapter of Deuteronomy may be noticed. In verse 11 we read: "of all clean birds ye may eat," in 20 (LXX 19) "of all clean fowls ye may eat." One or the other of these will be the work of a glossator. But which? The latter verse is omitted by a₂, and accordingly a presumption arises that it is a commentator's summary of what had preceded.

The foregoing examples represent some of the most elementary steps that can be taken towards freeing the Biblical text from glosses by comparison of parallel passages. They are merely typical of what has happened to the text of the Pentateuch, and accordingly every kind of available evidence should be carefully scrutinized with a view to the recovery of the earliest text attainable. Invaluable material is presented in the Versions and should be utilized to the fullest extent. But there is also room for what is known as *flair* and for the processes of trained scholarship. We shall learn how to do the work only by doing it, and the labors of a generation or two of scholars will be required before secure results are obtained. Much systematic work will be required, and, do not let us forget to add, much unsystematic work. This will appear a very heretical dictum in days when "method," "system," "organization," and similar conceptions are worshiped as the be-all and the end-all of the human intellect; but it is nevertheless true that they have their limitations, like all other conceptions, and prove fatal if carried too far. I propose therefore to close this paper by drawing attention to two or three passages that have thrust themselves on my notice from a textual point of view, and I do not doubt that anybody who will take the trouble to go into the matter will see that in reality they are merely typical of scores of other passages, and suggest numbers of problems that have never even been considered.

In Leviticus ii. 13 we read:—

(a) And every oblation of thy meal offering shalt thou mix with salt;

(b) And thou shalt not suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meal offering;

(c) With all thine oblations thou shalt offer salt.

It must be obvious that two thirds of this is glossing. The command to offer salt with the oblation of a meal offering is the sole point alike of (a), (b), and (c). It is equally obvious that (a) and (c) are totally devoid of any distinction of style and are much more suited to a glossator than (b), with its reference to a covenant and its avoidance of the technical *corban* (oblation). It must, however, be noted that this clause itself has a history. The LXX omits the introductory "and"; its authorities are divided as to the verb, the Old Latin, for example, rendering "non cessabit sal," and for the Massoretic "thy God" most Septuagintal MSS. have *κυριου* "Lord." It certainly cannot be said that such a verse as this should be accepted in the Massoretic text without inquiry, and it merely exemplifies what is to be found in innumerable other passages.

In Leviticus iv. 12 we read: "and he shall bring out the whole bullock to without the camp to a clean place to the pouring out of ashes and burn it on wood with fire on the pouring out of ashes it shall be burnt." It leaps to the eyes in the Hebrew that "to the pouring out of ashes and burn" אל שפך הרשן ושדף and "on the pouring out of ashes it shall be burnt" על שפך הרשן ישרף cannot both be right. "It shall be burnt" is omitted by the Septuagintal MS. m, but we have no other clue. Either therefore we must read "to the pouring out of ashes and burn it on wood" or else "and burn it on wood on the pouring out of ashes." Both are awkward, for in the one case we have "to without the camp to a clean place to the pouring out of ashes" and in the other "on wood on the pouring out," but the phrases about a "clean place without the camp" may be a mere gloss founded on vi. 4 (11). The phrase "with fire" is apparently omitted by an Old Latin copy, and rightly. The addition of this expression after "burn"

is one of the commonest instances of the amplificatory gloss. It may be added that the word "whole" is misplaced in gn and omitted by b. Thus an earlier form of this verse seems to have run "and he shall bring out the bullock (? without the camp) to the pouring out of ashes and burn it on wood." It will be observed that, as so frequently happens, the meaning is unaffected.

The amount of commentary embodied in the text of such passages as Leviticus xxii. is probably startlingly large. The work of disentangling the original will not be easy, but experience should yield canons that will assist future investigations. It may be laid down generally that a command will not be repeated in the same context without definite reasons, and that consequently many of the continual repetitions are merely the work of annotators. It may further be suggested that where a general principle is followed by a catalogue of instances, the latter is likely to be due to a commentator. Thus in Leviticus xxi. 17 we read: "whosoever he be of thy seed throughout their generations that hath a blemish, let him not approach to offer the bread of his God." And this is followed by a repetition and catalogue: "18 For whatsoever man he be that hath a blemish, he shall not approach; a blind man, or a lame, or he that hath a flat nose or anything superfluous, 19 or a man that is broken footed," etc. I do not believe any of this to be part of the original text, nor indeed much of what follows in the same chapter.

A few simple instances of the way in which Deuteronomy has been annotated are not without interest.

In xiv. 27, "thou shalt not forsake him" was unknown to the original LXX and added by Origen. Thus the sentence should run on from verse 26, "Thou shalt rejoice, thou, and thy household, and the Levite that is within thy gates for,"

etc. In verse 29 the words "for he has no lot or portion with thee" are omitted by bw and m. They have come in from verse 27. In xvi. 9 the words "shalt thou begin to number seven weeks," which merely repeat the beginning of the verse, are wanting in the Vulgate and Eusebius; in verse 10 B omits "according as the Lord thy God blesseth thee"; in verse 11 the original LXX lacked "and that is within thy gates," bw and m omit "in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to set his name there," and m also omits "that are in the midst of thee"; verse 14 is unknown to bw and d. And this sort of testimony occurs repeatedly — generally with a gain to the lucidity and vigor of the passage.

The examination of a text word by word on the lines suggested above may seem a very tedious and thankless task. It will, however, carry with it two rewards. The first is the construction of a better text; and this is more alluring than appears at first sight, on account of the superior literary merits of the true original. The second is the light that will be thrown on the larger problems of the Pentateuch. Progress is not to be attained by making theories and then adapting the facts to them; on the contrary, the true direction of research leads to the examination of facts followed by the growth of such theories as arise naturally from them. It is impossible to say *a priori* to what discoveries textual work will lead, for in this branch of research, as much as in any, it is the unexpected that happens. That the study of glosses and glossing will, however, do a great deal to elucidate the history of the Pentateuch seems to me already to be beyond dispute.

We have all of us seen books containing an island of text surrounded by commentaries and explanations of commentaries. It seems to me that this provides a fairly close par-

allel to the Pentateuch, the chief difference lying in the fact that the earlier commentaries have successively become incorporated in the text.

Naturally this study must be combined with that of other textual phenomena, editorial principles (including the principles of transpositions), and the correction of false readings. Taken together, these investigations, if successfully prosecuted, should make a vast difference to our comprehension of the Bible and of all the ancillary subjects that are bound up with it.