

## KLOSTERMANN ON THE PENTATEUCH.

IN the autumn of 1890, Professor Aug. Klostermann, of Kiel, published in the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*,<sup>1</sup> two articles entitled *Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuches*. The occasion of these articles appears to have been the appearance, in 1888, of Kautzsch and Socin's convenient edition of the text of Genesis (in German), with the different sources of which, according to the best modern writers, it is composed distinguished typographically; for, after stating at some length, though not always very distinctly, his own theory of the origin of the Pentateuch, he closes with a criticism of the work of these scholars, whom he censures for performing their task in disregard of certain principles which, he asserts, they ought to have uniformly kept before them. From references which have been made in this country to these articles—most recently by a writer in the *Church Quarterly Review*,<sup>2</sup> it would seem that their import has been somewhat misapprehended; and hence it has occurred to me that it might be worth while to explain to readers of the EXPOSITOR what Klostermann's position is, and how he conceives the Pentateuch to have arrived at its present form.

Klostermann begins<sup>3</sup> by objecting to the functions assigned by modern critics to the "Redactor": he is a personage, he says, who is "everywhere and nowhere," who eludes our grasp, for he possesses no definite character or method by which he may be recognised. Critics have too often begun their investigations with Genesis; the

<sup>1</sup> Nos. 9, 10.

<sup>2</sup> Jan., 1892, pp. 355, 366, 367.

<sup>3</sup> P. 622 f.

“fixed point” with which they ought rather to have started is Deuteronomy. Here there is a Redactor whose individuality is perfectly distinct.<sup>1</sup> The Deuteronomic editor, who incorporated in the Pentateuch the Deuteronomic law-book, discovered under Josiah (*i.e.* Deut. v.-xxvi., xxviii.), together with the section of “JE” containing the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxi. 16-22; xxxii. 1-43, 44), and who prefixed to that law-book Deuteronomy i.-iv. for the purpose of connecting it with Numbers, and added at the end the hortatory and other matter contained in Deuteronomy xxix., xxx., xxxi. 1-15, 23-30 and xxxii. 45-47,<sup>2</sup> is a “living person,” whose style and aims can be readily ascertained. Twenty years ago,<sup>3</sup> Klostermann laid down, once for all,<sup>4</sup> the canons for distinguishing what belongs to Deuteronomy proper (Deut. v.-xxvi.), and what is due to this Deuteronomizing editor (Deut. i.-iv., xxix., etc.): Hollenberg, in 1874, applied these canons with much success to the analysis of the Book of Joshua,<sup>5</sup> and nothing which has materially advanced our knowledge of the literary history of Deuteronomy has since been written.<sup>6</sup>

According to the view of the older critics, the Elohist document (P), because Genesis happens to begin with an extract from it (Gen. i. 1-ii. 4), was reputed the earliest of the Pentateuchal sources: it is one of “the most brilliant proofs” of Wellhausen’s insight and sagacity, that he perceived that the narrative of P, as it is disengaged by

<sup>1</sup> P. 625.

<sup>2</sup> These particulars are not stated in Klostermann’s present article, but they are contained in the article in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1871, p. 249 ff., to which he refers.

<sup>3</sup> In the article just referred to.

<sup>4</sup> “Endgültig festgestellt.”

<sup>5</sup> *Studien und Kritiken*, 1874, p. 462 ff. Hollenberg, adopting the distinction laid down by Klostermann, argues here that the Deuteronomic passages of Joshua (D<sup>2</sup> in my *Introduction*) are the work of the same hand which added to the original Deuteronomy the passages mentioned in the text. Hollenberg’s conclusion is endorsed by Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, p. 131 ff.

<sup>6</sup> P. 626.

criticism, never existed as an original independent source, but could only be accounted for by the supposition that it was written with direct reference to "JE," and consequently that it is later than JE.<sup>1</sup> Klostermann, however, made this discovery twenty-five years ago, before even Graf saw the truth clearly, and before Wellhausen had written a word; and he has watched with interest the course of Pentateuch analysis since; for instead of having to unlearn anything, he has seen it confirm more and more strongly the conclusion which he had himself then reached independently.<sup>2</sup> He only regrets that Wellhausen has not gone further, and seen with him that the author of P, whose literary characteristics are so clearly defined, and whose narrative is written with constant reference to JE, and as it were "encloses it," is the true long-sought "Redactor": J and E, as Wellhausen has very acutely seen, are throughout two *parallel* narratives, which for this very reason could be readily united into one. P pre-supposes JE, and is based upon it, being simply compiled as a kind of margin, or framework, in which to place JE.<sup>3</sup> Imagine that there existed two Greek texts of the Book of Judges—as in fact there actually exist, in the ordinary LXX. and in Lucian's recension<sup>4</sup>—each similar, but at the same time each marked by certain peculiarities of diction, and imagine further that all copies of the book were lost except two, which

<sup>1</sup> P. 627.

<sup>2</sup> P. 731. Klostermann, however, while thus accepting Wellhausen's view of the *relative* dates of JE and P, expressly remarks that he does not agree with him in the *absolute* dates which he assigns to them.

<sup>3</sup> P. 627.

<sup>4</sup> But Klostermann's theory, which he here refers to, that the LXX. version of Ecclesiastes is derived from Aquila, has been shown recently to be untenable. Dillmann, in the *Sitzungsberichte der Kön.-Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, 1892, p. 3 ff., proves from a minute and exhaustive study of its peculiarities, that it is really an older version, which has merely been revised on the basis of Aquila's translation. (An interesting parallel, to which Dillmann refers, is Holmes' MS. 62 of the Prophets, belonging to the library of New College, Oxford: see Cornhill's *Ezechiel*, pp. 104-8).

were partly fragmentary, and partly exhibited a mixed text, and that an editorial committee undertook to construct out of these a single consecutive text of the entire book, the method followed by them would surely be to supply any failure and obscurity of the one from the other, in particular passages to let that one speak which was most complete, or most legible or intelligible, and where the choice was difficult, to set side by side the expressions of both. What philologist, when he came to study the result of their labours, would infer, from the existence of the mixed text which it would present, that it was the work of two *separate* historians? What he would infer would be merely the existence of two *recensions* of one and the same text.<sup>1</sup>

What has just been assumed, now, as a hypothetical case has actually taken place in our Hebrew Bible. None of the writings contained in the Hebrew Bible have come to us in the form in which they left their authors' hands; they have reached us with all the alterations which the Jewish community and its teachers, by long use, introduced into them for the practical purpose of edifying the hearer.<sup>2</sup> "The Hebrew text is no railroad, along which one only has to move in order to be landed safely, without exertion, in the period when the Biblical writings were in process of formation. It is rather a pass, which prescribes to the pedestrian the places to be passed on the way, but affords him no guarantee that he will arrive at his goal—at the point, viz. whence slowly wandering, with change of colour and of original garb, the sacred writings have finally come to our hands." And this is especially true of the Law.<sup>3</sup>

The Pentateuch arose thus.<sup>4</sup> Passages such as Exodus

<sup>1</sup> P. 628. Though Klostermann does not say it in so many words, the inference which he appears to suggest by this comparison, and which is drawn also by the reviewer in the *Church Quarterly* (p. 355, note, at the end), is that J and E are not (as Wellhausen and most other critics have supposed) two *independent* narratives, but two *recensions* of one and the same narrative.

<sup>2</sup> P. 628.

<sup>3</sup> P. 632.

<sup>4</sup> P. 701-3.

xxiv. 7, Deuteronomy xxxi. 9 ff., show that at the time when they were written public readings of the Law were an old-established institution. These readings, however, would not be confined to the "Law," in the narrower sense of the term; they would include historical matter as well. Explanatory narratives, for instance, would be needed, for the purpose of giving some information respecting the occasions on account of which particular ceremonies were to be observed, and of bringing the worshippers into a right frame of mind for taking part in them worthily; and the histories of the patriarchs would be recounted for the sake of the moral and religious lessons which they contained. The narratives compiled for such purposes were recited principally at the great festivals,<sup>1</sup> which for a while, however, had a local or "communal" character;<sup>2</sup> and hence the narrative also would assume naturally a variety of types in different localities. As soon, however, as the sanctuary at Jerusalem began more and more to command the veneration of Israelites, and worship became centralized, the priests there perceived the importance of offering to the pilgrims frequenting it all that they possessed before at their local sanctuaries; accordingly they turned their attention to collecting and harmonizing these various types of narrative, and combining them with the "Law," strictly so called. And so the first draft ("Urbild") of our Pentateuch took shape.<sup>3</sup> It consisted of the local traditions combined with the accompanying laws into a continuous narrative,<sup>4</sup> the whole being sur-

<sup>1</sup> Klostermann understands the מִקְרָא קָדֶשׁ of Lev. xxiii. 3, etc., in the sense, not of a "holy convocation," but of a "sacred reading."

<sup>2</sup> And so Klostermann (p. 703) renders Hos. xii. 4b [Heb. 5b]: "He (the angel) let him reach [בֵּיתֵינוּ] Bethel; and there he speaks with us, saying (v. 6 [Heb. 7]), Keep mercy and judgment, and wait continually on thy God" —the history of Jacob was read to the pilgrims visiting the holy place at Bethel in such a manner that it seemed as if the dead patriarch himself preached to them the principles which his life illustrated.

<sup>3</sup> P. 704.

<sup>4</sup> *i. e.* (presumably) JE.

rounded by a learned priestly margin,<sup>1</sup> which provided the reader or preacher with such fuller explanations as were necessary. Klostermann is conscious here of the objection that this hypothesis seems to expose the truth of the Divine word to arbitrary human alteration: but he meets it by remarking that it is not the bare word as such which is spiritually operative, but the word as *assimilated by the believing community*; and hence the community, once brought effectively under its influence, may "re-act" upon the documents which declare it, and modify them for purposes of edification.

But between this draft of the Pentateuch and Ezra, "much water has run down the hill."<sup>2</sup> The original standard codex thus fixed by the priests might be superseded by new standard editions; by the side of it there were, moreover, the manuscripts of the schools and of rich private persons, which were naturally still more exposed to annotations, insertions of parallel passages, alterations of style, and other accidents: the original standard copy (or copies) perished with the other archives of the Temple when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Chaldæans. Between this catastrophe and Ezra, through the lack of organization of the people and the absence of any standard text, the copies saved by single communities or families must by use have undergone at least as much change as Luther's Bible has done. The work of Ezra must have been to seek among the schools of the priests, Levites, and other Temple ministers, for such copies or fragments of the Pentateuch as seemed most trustworthy, and to combine these into a whole with all the care that he could command, making his selection, where they differed, according to the best of his judgment.<sup>3</sup>

The radical fault which Klostermann finds with all critics of the present generation is accordingly this: they take as

<sup>1</sup> *i.e.* P.

<sup>2</sup> P. 704.

<sup>3</sup> P. 705.

the basis of their investigations *the existing Massoretic text*; they assume practically *the identity of that with the original form of the Pentateuch*.<sup>1</sup> Hence their analysis, particularly in the case of "JE," is liable to be inconclusive, being founded upon distinctions which had no place in the original text. Modern critics ignore the long period, with the many textual modifications which it brought with it, between the original writers and Ezra; they forget that Ezra—or whoever else collected the sacred writings together in the manner just indicated—"had no *autographs* at his disposal; he had only what had been transferred from those autographs in the form of notes, reduced and altered, into the books of religious instruction belonging to different circles, and accordingly modified in different directions: his text consequently must have been a harmony of different forms of text synoptically combined."<sup>2</sup>

Klostermann next gives illustrations of the changes which the text of Genesis may have undergone, and which he thinks are not duly allowed for by modern critics. One Divine name, for instance, may have been substituted for another; the old historical style, especially in dialogue, often simply wrote the verb or pronoun (*e.g.* "and *he* said," "and he said to *him*"), which, being ambiguous, was filled in by a later scribe, sometimes incorrectly;<sup>3</sup> the variation in the names of the patriarch, Jacob and Israel, in the latter part of Genesis (which have been pointed out as characteristic of E and J respectively) is due to the same cause; the original author would have used uniformly the name "Israel" after the change of name by God, but there were places in which this was awkward, and so "Jacob" was substituted: old expressions, again, were translated into

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 710, 711, 731.

<sup>2</sup> P. 711.

<sup>3</sup> The addition of the "explicit" subject, or object, sometimes in the LXX., sometimes in the Hebrew text, is a point which was much insisted on, and convincingly illustrated, by Wellhausen in his *Text der Bücher Samuelis* (1871).

modern phraseology, the explanation sometimes being introduced into the text beside them : glosses, corrections, various readings, etc., noted originally on the margin, often afterwards found their way into the text. It is, of course, no doubt true that the Hebrew text has sometimes suffered corruption from the causes here indicated ; but it is to be observed that of the examples adduced by Klostermann, very few indeed are cogent,<sup>1</sup> and the majority rest upon nothing but conjecture. Two of his examples will be found below, pp. 332, 333.

Such is Klostermann's view of the origin of the Pentateuch, stated, as far as possible, in his own words. It is not my intention to criticise it : the grounds upon which it rests, and other details respecting it, are not developed with sufficient fulness for a criticism to be satisfactory. Like most of Klostermann's work, if apt to be arbitrary, it is also original and suggestive ; and though constructed largely upon a purely speculative basis, it may not impossibly contain elements of truth. But the question that I desire to ask is this : What advantage, from a conservative point of view, does Klostermann's theory possess above that of Wellhausen, or (to make the issue more definite) above that which I have myself adopted ? It is probable that Klostermann recognises in the law a larger Mosaic element than Wellhausen does ; whether he recognises a larger element than I do, I am unable to say, for he has not (so far as I am aware) expressed himself explicitly on the subject. But Klostermann is a critic, and adopts critical methods, just as much as Wellhausen does : he recognises the same

<sup>1</sup> We cannot, for instance, feel any assurance in xv. 6, because the Hebrew has "in Jehovah" and the LXX. "in God," that the original text had simply "in him" : the LXX. may have rendered inexactly. xxvii. 28 ויתן לך האלהים *may* have read originally לך יתן לך, והוּ הוּ being afterwards swallowed up in the preceding יהוה, and האלהים being then added as a subject to יתן ; but there is no proof, or even need, of such an assumption. (As inscriptions show, the oldest orthography of יהוה would have been יהוה, not יהו.)



phenomena as other critics do, though he explains some of them differently. Thus he does not doubt that "P" is both distinct from "JE," and added to it afterwards: <sup>1</sup> he does not deny that "JE" is composite, though he denies that the elements of which it consists are any longer distinguishable: <sup>2</sup> he even recognises strata in J and E, <sup>3</sup> though he holds them to have been introduced into the text at a stage other than that which Wellhausen supposes: in Deuteronomy, he recognises in the discourses two distinct hands, and was also one of the first to perceive, what has since been generally accepted by critics, that the Song in chap. xxxii. came originally into the book as part of a section of JE. Again Klostermann, it is true, is dissatisfied with Wellhausen's "redactor"; but he has a couple of redactors

<sup>1</sup> The reviewer in the *Church Quarterly* writes: "Klostermann objects that Kautzsch and Socin distinguish" typographically, in their edition of Genesis, "P, JE, J<sup>1</sup>, J<sup>2</sup>, and R, as though the whole thing were plain as noonday" (p. 355), and "Klostermann has a right to dispute that the origin of the sections ascribed to P is certain" (p. 367). These statements are incorrect. The reviewer has written hastily, and not observed that *the delimitation of P is not included in Klostermann's criticism*. He thoroughly accepts P as the work of a distinct hand. His criticism of Kautzsch and Socin's analysis is confined to the manner in which they have dealt with JE and the "Redactor." (A subordinate point is his objection that by their method of translation these scholars have sometimes introduced distinctions not existing in the original Hebrew, and obliterated distinctions which are there. There is force in this criticism; but as it concerns only the *translation*, it is irrelevant to the present issue.)

<sup>2</sup> Klostermann does not enter into details: hence it is not clear whether he holds them to be uniformly and throughout inseparable. But unless they could in some degree, and in particular cases, be distinguished, it is not apparent what ground would exist for holding "JE," as Klostermann does hold it, to be composite. In so far as Klostermann merely insists that beyond a certain point the analysis of JE becomes doubtful, he confirms the opinion which I had expressed myself in my *Introduction* some months before his articles appeared (p. 12 note, with reference to Kautzsch and Socin themselves, p. 18 note, pp. 35, 36, and elsewhere). Wellhausen, also, in particular cases, frequently speaks similarly. The merit of Kautzsch and Socin's volume is that, without claiming finality for this part of their work, they present lucidly a definite view of the structure of JE, suitable to form a practical basis for further study.

<sup>3</sup> He speaks of J<sup>1</sup>, J<sup>2</sup>, E<sup>1</sup>, E<sup>2</sup>, etc., as "unleugbare Färbungen," which Wellhausen's delicate literary feeling ("der feinfühlige Wellhausen") has discriminated (p. 623).

himself, who perform precisely similar offices ; and what is more, he postulates] besides a multitude of scribes, whose name is Legion, and who were engaged during many centuries in modifying, partly for purposes of edification, partly for the sake of securing literary intelligibility and consistency, the original text of the Law. In what respect are Klostermann's scribes—whose functions (their existence once granted) are of a character that cannot be arbitrarily limited—less objectionable than Wellhausen's redactors, who at least are very much less numerous, and whose work is definite, and assigned to them on definable grounds? What advantage, from a historical point of view, does the theory that J and E are two *recensions* of one and the same text, which by gradual change have come to differ from one another as they now do, possess above the theory that they are two *narratives* written independently? If the former theory be the true one, by what criterion can we determine which of the two recensions represents the narrative in its primitive form, or what guarantee do we possess that this is done by either? To myself, I must own, it seems incredible that the phenomena displayed by J and E can be attributed to the causes which Klostermann indicates; but to examine the theory upon its merits is not my present purpose. The writer of the article in the *Church Quarterly Review* appears to be under the impression<sup>1</sup> that Klostermann's articles have "not a little 'fluttered the Volscians in Corioli'" (*i.e.* the critics); but the "fluttering" ought rather, it would seem, to be in the camp to which the Reviewer belongs himself; for if Klostermann's utterances possess the authority and decisiveness which he seems plainly disposed to attach to them, the traditional position cannot any longer be consistently maintained.

So much for Klostermann's theory of the origin of the Pentateuch, as he himself holds it. I now proceed to offer

<sup>1</sup> P. 366, note.

the reader some illustrations of his methods of textual criticism. In my *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*<sup>1</sup> (as afterwards in my *Introduction*),<sup>2</sup> I had ventured to caution the student that Klostermann was often to be distrusted as a textual critic; and Prof. Cheyne, in a note in the *EXPOSITOR*,<sup>3</sup> referred to what I had there said in support of his very moderately expressed judgment on the same subject. For this reference to myself he is somewhat severely taken to task by the Reviewer in the *Church Quarterly*,<sup>4</sup> who, "with all respect," claims the right to question my "infallibility" on this point, and adds that "it appears quite within the range of possibility that Klostermann may be right in thinking" my "textual criticism a little at fault." What Klostermann's opinion on this subject is, I cannot certainly say: in all probability, if he has seen what I have written relating to it, while taking a different view of particular passages, on the whole he would agree with me so far as I go,<sup>5</sup> but would consider that I was not nearly radical enough in assuming that the Hebrew text needed correction. But, without laying any claim to "infallibility"—which, it is needless to remark, Prof. Cheyne had no intention of imputing to me—I anticipate no difficulty in showing that, if the Reviewer seriously holds that Klostermann's methods are sound, he must be a textual critic *sui generis*, at least in this country. For Klostermann's textual criticism, where he follows lines of his own, is remarkable for its arbitrariness and extravagance. Not only is he apt to assume corruption of the Hebrew text upon very insufficient grounds, but he often proposes corrections both violent in themselves, and also, as Hebrew, forced and unidiomatic. That he is independent and original, no one

<sup>1</sup> P. v.<sup>2</sup> Pp. 162, 175.<sup>3</sup> Aug., 1891, p. 157.<sup>4</sup> P. 367, note.<sup>5</sup> I infer this from the fact that he accepts a large number of the restorations of Thenius and Wellhausen (based upon the Versions), which I accept likewise.

will deny; that among the immense number of emendations which he has proposed some are clever and probable, there is also no reason to dispute: but that he follows false clues, has an imperfect feeling for Hebrew modes of expression, and extends to unreasonable limits the licence of purely conjectural emendation—of emendation, that is, unsupported by the testimony of any ancient version, is abundantly clear from the examples which his writings supply.

Let me justify what I have said by placing some concrete illustrations before the reader. The first two shall be taken from the articles which have been already referred to.

In Genesis xv. 2, 3, Klostermann severely censures the critics for finding in the name Eliezer a criterion of E. He does not, it is true, appear to apprehend correctly the ground on which they do this; but, whether the ground be sufficient or not, under Klostermann's treatment the name disappears from the text altogether, with the whole of v. 3 at the same time.<sup>1</sup> The words in v. 2, which now read "The steward of my house is (R.V.) Dammesek Eliezer," or (Dillmann) ". . . is Damascus (the city) of Eliezer," read originally, according to Klostermann, "The steward of my house has furnished me with help" (דַּמְשֵׁק אֵלִי עֵזֶר);<sup>2</sup> the first part of v. 3 is a gloss on "childless" in v. 2, and the second part a gloss on the words that have been just translated, after they had become corrupted to their present form. דַּמְשֵׁק is a word with which the Hebrew student will be unfamiliar; it is the Arabic *damshaga*, with the meaning *deproperavit, cito expedit*. "Dammesek" in this verse is a well-known difficulty, and many suggestions have been made about it; but I feel I may predict with confidence that no Hebrew

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 719, 729.

<sup>2</sup> "Hat mir (יָגַע) mit hingebendem Eifer die von Eigenen Kindern zu erwartende Hilfe (עֵזֶר) geleistet."

scholar qualified to form an independent judgment will endorse Klostermann's "restoration": quadriliteral verbs are exceedingly rare in Hebrew, and the importation into Hebrew of such a word from the Arabic is alone sufficient to condemn it.

Genesis xxi. 7. We read in the existing Hebrew text: "And she said, Who would have said to Abraham, Sarah shall give suck to children?" These words are apparently clear and simple enough; the perfect tense מלל is a little unusual, but there are analogies which seem to support it;<sup>1</sup> and any one who still entertains grammatical scruples could easily remove them by supposing that ו had fallen out after מי, and reading for מי מלל, מי ימלל, מי. In Klostermann's hands,<sup>2</sup> however, the verse reads: "(v. 6, Every one that heareth will laugh at me,) Saying, Who is managing for Abraham the business of begetting? who has cleared the honour of Sarah's womb?"<sup>3</sup> Is it possible that the author of this remarkable emendation can be gifted with the "keen sense of humour" which the Reviewer discovers in his writings?<sup>3</sup>

The following examples are taken from Klostermann's elaborate, and in many respects meritorious, commentary on the books of Samuel and Kings, in Strack and Zöckler's *Kurzgefasster Kommentar* (1887).

1 Samuel i. 9. "And Hannah arose, after (their) eating in Shiloh." For these words Klostermann reads—with-

<sup>1</sup> See my *Hebrew Tenses*, § 19, 2.

<sup>2</sup> P. 720.

<sup>3</sup> Lest I should be thought to have misrepresented Klostermann, I append the German, "Wer besorgt für den Abraham das Geschäft der Zeugung (פלר) [sic] for (מלל), wer hat den Mutterschoss der Sara wieder zu Ehren gebracht" מן נקה בטן מי for מי נקה בטן or מי נקה בנין, LXX.)? (פלר is of course a misprint presumably for מלל). ותאמר, "and she said," at the beginning of the verse is supposed to have been substituted for לאמר, "saying," after the following words had reached their present corrupt state.

out any authority in antiquity whatever—"And she arose, and left her food behind her in the dining-parlour."

1 Samuel i. 15. Here Hannah says to Eli, "Nay, my lord, I am a woman קִשְׁתָּ רִיחַ; I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink, but I poured out my soul before the LORD." The expression קִשְׁתָּ רִיחַ presents a difficulty: it would mean by analogy "of a hardened spirit"; but as this is unsuited to the context, most modern commentators, following the guidance of the LXX., which has ἡ σκληρὰ ἡμέρα, read יִם קִשְׁתָּ, *lit.*, hard of day, *i.e.* unfortunate—an expression which occurs (in the masc.) in Job xxx. 26. This however does not satisfy Klostermann; he proposes אִשָּׁה קִשְׁתָּ דָּוָה אֲנֹכִי—a phrase, the meaning of which I will leave the Hebrew student to divine for himself. When he has discovered it, I venture to think he will agree with me that it is not only grammatically very strained, but also singularly tasteless and out of place.

1 Samuel xi. 12. "And the people said unto Samuel, Who is he that said, Shall Saul reign over us?" Klostermann: "And the people said unto Samuel, Who is he that said, Let the devil rather reign over us!" "Devil," it is fair to say, is only Klostermann's accommodation to modern notions of "Sheol" (=Hades), which is obtained from שְׂאוּל "Saul," by a simple change of punctuation. But though the personification of Sheol might be suitable in a highly poetical context (Isa. xiv. 9), it is wholly inappropriate in a popular exclamation. And it seems, moreover, that even this is not, in Klostermann's view, the original form of the verse: from the note it appears that he holds this to have been, "And the people said unto Saul, Do not rule (אֵל תְּמַלֶּךְ) for שְׂאוּל (יִמְלֶךְ) over us."

1 Samuel xiv. 25. Here the LXX. have καὶ πάντα ἡ γῆ ἤριστα καὶ Ἰααλ δρυμὸς ἦν μελισσῶνος κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ἀγροῦ. It may readily be granted that Ἰααλ δρυμὸς are a

couple of doublets to *μελισσῶνος*, or various representations of the ambiguous word יַעַר,<sup>1</sup> and may, therefore, in a restoration of the Hebrew text on which the Greek version is based, be disregarded. Klostermann however goes further, and emending *ἡρίστα*, somewhat violently, into *ἐργάται* or *ἐργασία*, reads וְכָל הָאָרֶץ עֲבָדֵי יַעַר דְּבַשׁ עַל פְּנֵי הַשָּׂדֶה, a lame and questionable sentence, which however is rendered, "And all the country were makers of honey upon the open field" (*i.e.* were devoted to bee-culture).<sup>2</sup>

xiv. 32. Heb. text: "And he said, Ye have dealt treacherously: roll a great stone unto me this day" (*viz.* for the altar, *vs.* 34-5). Klost.: "And he said, Roll their transgression upon me. Here will I prepare (a table) for God."<sup>3</sup>

xv. 29: "And also the glory of Israel will not lie nor repent." Klost.: "And even though we both plead against Him, God is upright; <sup>4</sup> He will not lie nor repent." נִצַּח, rendered on the margin of the Revised Version, *victory* or *glory*, is a somewhat peculiar word; but it seems, to judge from the usage of the corresponding root in Aramaic,<sup>5</sup> to denote Jehovah as the *splendour* or *majesty* of Israel. At any rate, even if this word be corrupt, Klostermann's emendation is far too forced and prosaic to be probable.

<sup>1</sup> Which means both "forest" and "flowing honey" (Cant. v. 1).

<sup>2</sup> "Und betrieb die ganze Gegend Bienenwirthschaft auf dem Blachfeld." There is another example of an emendation founded upon an arbitrary alteration of the Greek text in v. 24. The restoration in i. 15 (above, p. 334) is obtained similarly. *γυνή ἢ σκληρὰ ἡμέρα*, or, as the clause reads in Lucian's recension, *γυνή ἐν σκληρᾷ ἡμέρᾳ*, is assumed to be a corruption of *γυνή ἐν σκληραϊμορροῖα*, a word, which, though formed, as Klostermann observes, on the analogy of *σκληροφθαλμία*, is not, so far as I am aware, otherwise known.

<sup>3</sup> *i.e.* בְּגִדְתֶם גְּלוֹ אֱלֹהִים אֲכֹן לְאַלְהִים.  
for בְּגִדְתֶם גְּלוֹ אֱלֹהִים אֲבֹן נְדוּלָה.

<sup>4</sup> *i.e.* וְגַם נִצַּח לֹו שְׁנִינוּ יֵשֶׁר אֵל.  
for וְגַם נִצַּח יִשְׂרָאֵל.

<sup>5</sup> To shine, to be bright or famous, and especially to be victorious.

xv. 32: "Surely the bitterness of death is past." Klost.: "If it must be so, then, come on, O death!"<sup>1</sup> The first part of this emendation is supposed to be based upon the LXX., but their *εὶ οὕτως* merely implies the misreading of אָנֹכִי as הִכֹּנִי. סָב however (properly "turn round") is incorrectly rendered "come on" (*komm heran*): it is true, it is used by a king bidding his attendants perform their bloody work (xxii. 18): but there it clearly retains its proper force of *turn round* (viz. to attack another): it could not be used by a person bidding his assailant approach to attack *himself*.

One more example will be sufficient, from the opening words of David's lament over Saul and Jonathan in 2 Samuel i. The Hebrew text there reads: (18) "And he bade [*lit. said*] to teach the children of Judah (the) bow: behold, it is written in the book of Jashar.

(19) The beauty, O Israel, is slain upon thy high places:  
How are the mighty fallen!"

In Klostermann's hands this becomes:—"(18) And he said:

Attend, O Judah, to hard things,  
(19) And be grieved, O Israel;  
Slain ones (lie) upon thy high places,  
How are the mighty fallen!"

The supposed present corruption of *v.* 18 is due to a learned reader, who, comparing the song as it stood in the book of Jashar, added the reference to that book, transcribing at the same time the technical expression "to teach" prefixed to it there (cf. Ps. lx. *title*): he, however, committed, in what follows, the "slight mistake" of taking the first three words of the song בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה קָשֶׁת, "Attend, O Judah, to hard things") as the object of "to teach" (pronouncing them בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה קָשֶׁת, *i.e.* "the children of Judah

<sup>1</sup> *i.e.* אָנֹכִי סָב מֵרַחֲמֵי מוֹתָא for אָנֹכִי בָּנִי מֵרַחֲמֵי מוֹתָא.



(the bow"). In *v.* 19, הַצִּבִּי (the beauty, or, less probably, the gazelle) is a corruption of הַעֲצִי (Gen. xlv. 5), "be grieved." Many Hebrew scholars will admit that the words rendered "bow," and "beauty" (or "gazelle"), especially the former (which is omitted in the LXX.), are a little singular, and may possibly be due to some error; but there is no ground for supposing such a wholesale correction as this to be necessary: the rest of *v.* 18 was read by the LXX. as it is read now, and in *v.* 19 the text used by them had the consonants of הַצִּבִּי<sup>1</sup> as well.

Of course I cannot suppose that the Reviewer would seek to extol Klostermann for his sobriety and sound sense without possessing a competent knowledge of what he had written; and hence I must conclude that emendations such as these have his approval, and that he would wish to see English students adopt the methods of textual criticism which they exemplify. The preceding illustrations will, I trust, satisfy most readers of the EXPOSITOR that I was justified in expressing the caution<sup>2</sup> which to the Reviewer seemed so superfluous. I dwell reluctantly—for the task, I am sensible, is an ungracious one—upon the defects of an able and conscientious scholar: but the necessity has been forced upon me: it is a duty that is owing to students who might otherwise be misled to point out that, whatever Klostermann's abilities may be, a misdirected ingenuity and unregulated judgment lead him often into false tracks, and make him for the inexperienced an unsafe guide.

I may be allowed to conclude by referring to one or two other points relating to Hebrew scholarship, noticed in the same article. The writer brings against me in one place a somewhat grave charge:—

<sup>1</sup> The translators only vocalized it differently, viz. הַצִּבִּי (στυλωσησον; see 2 Sam. xviii. 18).

<sup>2</sup> As I have done elsewhere in similar instances (e.g. *Introduction*, p. 253 note, 254 note, 260, 337, 458).

“We should not be doing justice to our subject if we did not call attention to the remarkable recklessness of statement occasionally found in the higher criticism. Thus when we find Canon Driver, referring to the phrase ‘beyond Jordan,’ quotes Deut. i. 1, 5, iii. 8, iv. 41, and Josh. ix. 10, as implying that the author was resident in Western Palestine, can he possibly be ignorant of the fact that the same phrase (בעבר הירדן) is used in Deut. iii. 20, xi. 30 for the *western* side of Jordan, and similarly in Josh. v. 1, ix. 1, xii. 7 (cf. v. 1), xxii. 7, or that in Num. xxxii. 19 a phrase almost precisely similar (מעבר הירדן) is used for *both* sides of Jordan in the same verse? We do not pretend that this fact is decisive either way on the question of authorship, but it at least shows either great carelessness or a rooted determination to look at only one side of a question, when the passages mentioned above are cited as decisive without the slightest hint that there is any difficulty in the matter” (p. 359).

The Reviewer demands of me impossibilities. For a volume in which many different subjects have to be treated, he demands the fulness of a special commentary. In the present instance, however, I happen to possess a complete reply to his objection. I had fully examined the use of the phrase here referred to seven or eight years ago: and the following passage describing it has been in type for nearly four years, although, owing to circumstances beyond my control, it has not yet been published:—

The use of the phrase “beyond Jordan” for E. Palestine in Deut. i. 1, 5, iv. 41, 46, 47, 49 (as elsewhere in the Pentateuch: comp. Num. xxii. 1, xxxiv. 15), exactly as in Josh. ii. 10, vii. 7, ix. 10, etc., Judg. v. 17, x. 8, is said to imply that the author was resident in W. Palestine. It is indeed difficult to resist this inference. On the one hand, Deut. iii. 20, 25, xi. 30, and Josh. v. 1, ix. 1, xii. 7, show that the assumption sometimes made, that עבר הירדן had a fixed geographical sense (like *Gallia Transalpina*, etc.), and was used as a standing designation of the Transjordanic territory, irrespectively of the actual position of the speaker or writer, is incorrect; on the other hand, if its meaning was *not* thus fixed, its employment by a writer, whether in E. or W. Palestine, of the side *on which he himself stood*, is difficult to understand, unless the habit had arisen of viewing the regions on the two sides of Jordan as *contrasted with each other*;<sup>1</sup> and this of itself

<sup>1</sup> Hence its use in Josh. v. 1; ix. 1; xii. 7, written (presumably) in W. Palestine.

implies residence in Palestine. The question thus resolves itself into a prior one: was this a habit of the Canaanites, and did the usage suggested by it pass from them to the Israelites, before the latter had set foot in the land, and experienced the conditions likely to naturalize it amongst them? The *possibility* of this cannot, perhaps, be denied; at the same time it may be doubted whether it is probable. The use of the phrase in the Pentateuch generally, exactly as in Josh. ii. 10, etc., creates a presumption that the passages in question were written under similar local conditions.<sup>1</sup>

I venture to think that this passage completely rebuts the charge of "recklessness" which the Reviewer somewhat gratuitously brings against me.<sup>2</sup> His excuse, no doubt, will be that he was not, and could not be, aware of what I had written. But he might have inferred from the footnote on page 80 that I had discussed the matter more fully elsewhere: and it is perhaps hardly reasonable in a critic to assume that an author possesses no grounds for his conclusions because he does not happen to state them at length.

It is true Numbers xxxii. 19 is not referred to (though it was noticed in the original draft of the extract); for I did not suppose that any Hebrew scholar would quote it as having a bearing on the question. The Transjordanic tribes say there to Moses, "We will not inherit with them (the 9½ tribes) *on the side across Jordan and beyond*, for our inheritance has fallen to us *on the side across Jordan eastwards*." The usage here harmonizes with the statement in the extract that the phrase "across Jordan" had not a fixed geographical sense; but it falls further into the category of passages in which, in accordance with

<sup>1</sup> In Dent. iii. 20, 25, the (assumed) position of the speaker is naturally maintained. In v. 8, on the contrary, in a phrase of common occurrence (iv. 47; Josh. ii. 10, ix. 10), as in Josh. i. 14, 15, the point of view is that of the narrator, not of the speaker.

<sup>2</sup> If a corroborative opinion be desired, it may be found in an article by the present Bishop of Worcester in the *Contemporary Review*, January, 1888, p. 143 f., who draws from the expression exactly the same inference.

Hebrew idiom, the same expression repeated acquires a contrasted meaning in virtue of the juxtaposition. So 1 Samuel xxiii. 26, we read (literally) "on the side of the mountain off here, and on the side of the mountain off here" = (Anglice) "on *the one* side of the mountain, and on *the other* side of the mountain." 1 Samuel xx. 21, 22, "Behold, the arrows are *from thee and hither* . . . ; behold, the arrows are *from thee and beyond*" = "*this* side of thee" and "*that* side of thee"; and, with the same word as in Numbers, 1 Samuel xiv. 4. (literally) "a rocky crag off the side across, off here; and a rocky crag off the side across, off here," *i.e.*, "a rocky crag on *the one* side, and a rocky crag on *the other* side." From the use of the term in Numbers xxxii. 19, nothing can be inferred as to its force when used *absolutely*, as is the case in Deut. i. 1, 5, etc.

The Reviewer is surprised (p. 363) that I have taken no notice in my *Introduction* of such facts as the traces of ancient case-endings in Genesis, which are supposed to be evidence of the antiquity of the book. I have taken no notice of them because their evidence is too insignificant to possess any weight. Did we indeed find in Genesis—or in the Pentateuch—case-endings habitually employed as such, while in other books they had disappeared from use, their existence would be strong evidence of the antiquity of the books in which they occurred. But we find nothing of the sort. In Genesis there are only five examples of case-endings altogether,<sup>1</sup> three in prose,<sup>2</sup> and two in poetry;<sup>3</sup> and in these the termination is not used with the force of a case, but is simply attached as a binding

<sup>1</sup> I disregard, of course, the  $\bar{\eta}$  *locale* (which corresponds to the Arabic accusative); for this is met with constantly, at every period of the language (*e.g.* 2 Chron. xxix. 18, 22, xxxii. 9, xxxiii. 11, 14, xxxvi. 6, 10).

<sup>2</sup>  $\bar{o}$  in Genesis i. 24 אֲרֵץ אֲרֵץ, *beast of the earth* (but not in *vv.* 25, 30, or elsewhere in the Pentateuch with the same word); *i* in Genesis xxxi. 39, twice.

<sup>3</sup> *i* twice in Genesis xlix. 11.

vowel to a substantive in the construct state,<sup>1</sup> apparently as a poetical or rhetorical ornament, precisely as happens from time to time in other books of the Old Testament. The fact that these terminations are used without any consciousness of their true significance does not support the theory that the books in which they are found belong to a specially early stage in the history of the language, and tends rather to prove, if it proves anything, that they are not earlier than other books in which the usage is similar. Were these terminations really marks of antiquity, it would be natural for them to be both more frequent themselves, and also to be accompanied by other archaic forms, which is just what we do not find. The *i* of Genesis xxxi. 39, xlix. 11, is found twice besides in the Pentateuch—Exodus xv. 6, Deuteronomy xxxiii. 16 (both poetical passages), but it occurs some *twenty-five* times in other books,—for instance, Hosea x. 11, Isaiah i. 21, xxii. 16 (twice); Obadiah 3; Micah vii. 14; six times in Jeremiah, as well as in several later writings. It is difficult, when it is used so often in books of the middle or later age of Hebrew, to argue that its occurrence in Genesis is a mark of antiquity. The *o* of Genesis i. 24 is rarer; this occurs three times in poetry in Numbers xxiii. 18, xxiv. 3, 15 (the prophecies of Balaam); in Psalm cxiv. 8; and, with the same word as in Genesis i. 24 (but followed, except in Psalm lxxix. 2, by different genitives), seven times in passages, none of them early, viz., Zephaniah ii. 14, Isaiah lvi. 9 (twice), Psalms l. 10, lxxix. 2, civ. 11, 20. Those who adduce this example as a mark of antiquity commonly say that it is borrowed in these other passages from Genesis i. 24; but we have no means of knowing this to have been

<sup>1</sup> *i* corresponds to the Arabic genitive; but, to be a true genitive, it should be attached to the word under government, not to the word governing; *i.e.*, it should be *גְּנִבְתָּ יוֹמִי* (a type of construction which never occurs in Hebrew), not (as it is) *יוֹם גְּנִבְתָּי*.

the case other than the assumption that Genesis i. 24 is older than they are : the argument is consequently circular ; and the supposition that an anomalous form remained in use in a particular word,<sup>1</sup> and could thus be used at pleasure by different writers, is equally probable, and would equally account for the phenomenon to be explained. The occurrences of ancient case-endings in the Pentateuch are too isolated, and too closely parallel to their appearance in admittedly later books, for an argument of any value to be founded upon them.

The case is substantially the same with other supposed marks of antiquity which have been pointed to in the Pentateuch. On the verdict of comparative philology, and the testimony of inscriptions, regarding the use of the pronoun הוּא for the feminine, I will not anticipate what I have written in another place.

S. R. DRIVER.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. לַיְלִיָּה, *night*, the accent of which shows that it is an old accusative, which is used almost uniformly, עֲוֹנֹתָהּ (or עֲלֵתָהּ), *iniquity*, which occurs five times, הַיָּרֵחַ, *sun*, which occurs once (Judges xiv. 18). See Kautzsch's 25th edition of Gesenius' *Grammar*, § 90. 2, 3, or my *Hebrew Tenses*, § 182.