

If any further proof were needed of the holy influence which this modern Fénelon exercised on the life of his royal pupil, we should find it in the closing words of the Crown Prince's last letter from San Remo :—

“ And now, my dear friend, farewell. Let me assure you, once again, that I bend as meekly before the Eternal One and resign myself as completely to His will as in the days when I was still a little child entrusted to your care.”

The last words of Dr. Godet to the sufferer were dated May 4, 1888, five weeks before the end :—

“ I have been reading over again in these days the story of your visit to the Mount of Olives. It was from that spot that He ascended. Unite yourself with Him that so you may rise together.”

JANE T. STODDART.

THE DIVINE NAMES IN GENESIS.

II. THE PERICOPE-HYPOTHESIS.

THE main thesis of Dahse's treatise cannot be more succinctly stated than in his own words (p. 99) : “ The divine names have nothing to do with this or that document, but are *variable elements of the text*.” His most original contribution to the investigation of the subject is an attempt to trace this variation through successive redactions of the text based upon the divisions of the Law in the lectionary of the Synagogue. The general idea that the distribution of the names for God is somehow influenced by the Synagogue reading is indeed not new ; but so far as I am aware Dahse is the first who has worked it out in elaborate detail, and constructed a theory by which the perplexing phenomena of the present text may be explained. It is this theory which I now proceed to expound and to criticise.

Its complexity is such that I almost despair of carrying the attention of the reader with me through the labyrinth of discussion into which we must enter.

Perhaps a short preliminary explanation will be found useful. For the purposes of the Sabbath reading in the Synagogue, the Pentateuch was divided into sections on two different systems. On one system, which was introduced in the Synagogues of Palestine, the Law was read through in three (or three and a half) years, and was divided into short sections called Sedarim. The other scheme, which seems to have originated in Babylonia, contemplated a reading of the Law in one year; consequently its sections, called Parashas (פרשיות, pl.), are on an average three times as long as the Sedarim. Thus the number of Parashas is 54, and that of the Sedarim is normally 154, although it is variously given as 161, 167, and even 175. In Genesis there are 43 (or 45) Sedarim and 12 Parashas. Now Dahse's theory, very roughly stated, is that the LXX text, as regards the divine names, is regulated by the Seder-division, while the Hebrew is influenced by the Parasha-division. And since the former division is known to be older than the latter, he concludes that the LXX represents an earlier stage of the text than the Hebrew. That, by the way, is a pure assumption. From the fact that the Seder-division is the older, it by no means follows that any problematical influence of that division on the divine names is prior to the fixation of the Massoretic text.

But here we must digress for a little to consider a question which Dahse has not thought it worth while to discuss, although it is surely vital to the argument, viz. the antiquity of the Synagogue lectionaries. On this point we have no certain information. Jewish tradition, which on such matters is utterly unreliable, attributes the system partly to Ezra and partly to Moses. Dahse assumes that the

Sedarim were arranged by Ezra in connexion with the final redaction of the Pentateuch (p. 161); but he has no proof of this apart from his own speculative combinations. An eminent Jewish scholar, Dr. Büchler, who has discussed the subject with great learning in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*,¹ arrives at the conclusion that the system was slowly developed under definite historical influences extending over four centuries. The earliest stage was the reading of prescribed portions of the Law at the three annual Feasts, which was introduced, as the result of a dispute with the Samaritans, about 200 B.C. The next was the selection of lessons for four special Sabbaths, and this dates from the time of the victory of the Pharisees over the Sadducees in B.C. 79. As to the completed Sedarim-lectionary, with which we are here concerned, all he ventures to say is that it was in use before the Christian era, and that it was considered ancient by Josephus in his time. He thinks the Parasha-division may have been introduced in the Synagogues of Babylonia by Rab about 200 A.D. Now these views may be right or they may be wrong; but the fact that they are advanced by a distinguished authority makes it very hazardous to build a hypothesis on the assumption that the Sedarim are of great antiquity. But, further, I think we can with great probability assign a superior limit for their introduction. The Samaritan Pentateuch has a division into sections (קציים) which is entirely different from the Jewish. Is it likely that if the triennial cycle had been known from the time of Ezra the Samaritans would have ignored it and devised an independent system for themselves? We may reasonably infer that the Sedarim are of later origin than the time when the Samaritans took over the Pentateuch from the Jews.

This is not the only inconvenient fact with which Dahse

¹ Vol. v. p. 420 ff.

deals in too summary a fashion. He is aware that the division of the Sedarim varies in different MSS.; that, e.g., while his authority, Baer, gives 43 in Genesis, the standard Massoretic authority, Jacob ben-Hayyim, gives 45, and that the latter has sections beginning at xi. 1, xxii. 20, xl. 1, xlix. 27, where the former has none; and, on the other hand, that the former has beginnings at xii. 10, xvii. 1, where the latter has none.¹ Dahse says this is immaterial to his system (p. v.); and indeed I am disposed to agree with him, for his theory seems elastic enough to fit a great many divisions of the text. But a theory to which it makes no difference whether or not a new Seder begins at xii. 10, or whether chaps. 16 and 17 form one Seder or two, may surely be suspected of undue laxity of principle.² But let us now resume our exposition.

If Dahse's hypothesis were, as a superficial reader might be apt to imagine, that the LXX and the Hebrew keep to one divine name throughout a Seder and a Parasha respectively, the issue would be simple. It would be easy to test the theory, and if it were found correct it would be all over with the documentary analysis of Genesis in so far as it depends on the use of the divine names. But the system is much more complex than this. (1) The editors had a mixed text to start with, i.e., one in which יהוה and אלהים occurred in irregular alternation. Of course it is this mixed original text that we want to get back to in order to see whether it affords any clue to a division of sources. Dahse's theory bars the way. He assures us that the original text is hopelessly obscured by subsequent editings, *more* hope-

¹ On the different divisions which obtained in different Massoretic schools, see Ginsburg, *Introduction*, pp. 33-35. It is much greater than I have stated above.

² As a matter of fact, Dahse makes a great deal of the division between xii. 1-9 and xii. 10-xiii, 18, and also of the fact that xvii. 1 is the commencement of a Seder.

lessly in the Massoretic text than in the LXX (p. 95). Still it is something to know that there *was* an original mixed text, and, though we can no longer be sure, we may surmise that it had something to do with a diversity of authorship to which so many independent circumstances point. (2) The editors behind the *Septuagint* (who operated with Sedarim) were guided by the following rules. They never (practically) change an *Elohim* into *Yahwe*; but in certain circumstances they change a *Yahwe* into *Elohim*. If they found either name used consistently throughout a Seder, they allowed it to stand. But if a Seder contained both *Yahwe* and *Elohim*, their practice was to let *Yahwe* stand at the beginning or end, and elsewhere to change it to *Elohim*.¹ (3) The editors of the *Massoretic text* (operating with Parashas) were "influenced" by the Parasha-division to this extent that they replaced "the *Elohim*s standing in the middle of the Sedarim by *Yahwe*," but only in "Elohimstellen . . . die mitten zwischen Yahweabschnitten lagen" (p. 94),—whatever that may mean. Whether they are supposed to have worked on the original mixed text, or on the recension already prepared for the LXX, Dahse nowhere expressly informs us, and I have been unable to discover for myself. These appear to be the leading features of the hypothesis, so far as they can be made out from Dahse's not very lucid or consecutive description.

Now before proceeding to test the theory in detail, I think it is not unfair to raise at once the question of its inherent credibility. There are three points to consider:—

1. We have to ask what time can be allowed for these postulated redactions. The Samaritan text agrees with the Massoretic as regards the divine names in all but eight or

¹ P. 93: ". . . die Stellen wo יהוה = κυριος immer den Anfang und Schluss (resp. ersten und letzten Gottesnamen) eines der alten Sedarim . . . enthalten."

nine cases,¹ so that, on Dahse's theory, both the assumed redactions must have been completed in the Synagogues of Palestine before the two texts parted company. We have seen reason to believe that the Seder-division of the Law is much younger than the Samaritan Pentateuch, and therefore the redactions could not even have been commenced until a long time after the separation had taken place. And apart from that, is it credible that the LXX translators had got hold of an obsolete Palestinian recension, which must have had a very short lease of life, and made it the basis of their version? That by itself is not absolutely impossible; but it will require pretty clear evidence to establish a theory in the teeth of so many improbabilities.

2. We must have some respect for the psychology of the supposed redactors. We are not at liberty to attribute to them *any* course of action that might bring about the actual result, as if they were dilettante triflers amusing themselves by inventing an elaborate cipher to tax the ingenuity of twentieth century critics. We must treat them as reasonable human beings, working from intelligible motives for intelligible practical ends. In short, we must be able to see that their *modus operandi* is directed to some useful purpose connected with the public reading of the Law. How does the theory stand this test? To take one example: what could have induced the LXX editors, in a "mixed" Seder, to leave the first and last יהוה standing, and to change the rest? Obviously, thinks Dahse, it was to indicate that *Yahwe* and *Elohim* are one God (p. 97). Granted that the hearers needed that reminder, one fails to see how this device would help them. It would no doubt ensure that

¹ According to the text of Walton's Polyglot, Sam. reads 'N for ' in Gen. vii. 1, xiv. 22, and xx. 18; ' for 'N in vii. 9, xxviii. 4, xxxi. 7, 9, 16; and adds 'N in xxxv. 9. The Sam. reading in vii. 1 is not quite certain. In xiv. 22 the names are a late addition to the text.

on the Sabbath when a "mixed" Seder was read they would hear both names; but when the lesson was an "unmixed" Seder they would be left to their own untutored reason. Why should the suggestion of identity be more necessary in the one case than the other? Would not consistency rather demand that at least in "unmixed" lessons marked by *Elohim* this name should be once changed to *Yahwe* to avert polytheistic misconceptions? All very trivial finical questions, no doubt! but a textual critic has no right to avoid triviality by vague and unconsidered generalities.

3. It is a most unwarranted assumption that editors of the text would have deliberately altered the divine names from any such artificial motive as that on which Dahse's hypothesis rests. The close agreement of the Jewish and Samaritan Pentateuchs in this respect, as contrasted with their frequent differences in other matters, seems to me a conclusive proof that the most scrupulous attention was paid to the divine names in the transmission of the text. Nor am I prepared to admit that even the LXX editors and copyists ever introduced wanton changes of the names of God. In comparison with the Jews and Samaritans they were somewhat careless, and they may often have substituted what they believed to be the better reading; but that they would have made *systematic* alterations of the kind here supposed I see no reason to believe.¹

¹ Dahse will no doubt appeal to the Elohist redaction of an entire section of the Psalter, and perhaps also to the regular use of *Yahwe* in the Targum of Onkelos, as evidence of a free handling of the divine names in authoritative Jewish circles at a late period in the history of the text. I deny the force of either analogy. The regular substitution of one divine name for another in writings *not yet canonised* affords no ground for the supposition that at a much earlier time sporadic changes might have been made in the oldest and most highly venerated part of the Canon, the Law. Still less is the levelling tendency of a *translation* (the Targum) an index to what would have been permitted in dealing with the sacred text itself. In any case one fact is not annulled by another. The agreement of the Heb. and Sam. is a critical fact which is explicable only by extreme care

But it will be said that these historical and *a priori* objections must give way to literary evidence, and that if the pericope-hypothesis shows a reasonable correspondence with the facts it must be accepted as proved. That will depend on what we consider to be a reasonable correspondence. The discoverer of a new theory is apt to be satisfied with a degree of approximation to fact which a less interested person finds disappointing; so that unless the correspondence be *exact* (which in this case it is not) there will be room for difference of opinion as to the value of the discovery. We must make the best of it, however; and I will now go on to examine how far Dahse's solution accounts for the distribution of the divine names in the different sections of Genesis.

We may first of all dispose of the very exceptional cases where an אלהים in the Hebrew is represented by (ο) κυριος in the LXX. It seems to me that Dahse here somewhat misunderstands the position of his opponents. He constantly argues as if the only possible explanation of the rarity of the instances where κυριος = אלהים were the shrinking of copyists from the use of the sacred tetragrammaton. For my part I have never believed that that is the chief cause of the phenomenon in question. I hold that the differences between the LXX and the MT in either direction are due to errors that have crept in during a long series of transcriptions, and that the main reason why ο θεος is substituted for κυριος so much more frequently than κυριος for ο θεος is simply that ο θεος came more readily to the pen of a Greek scribe than the Hebraic κυριος. Be that as it may, there are only three cases in Genesis

in the handling of the names from the time when the two texts diverged; and that is surely a more reliable indication of the feeling of the earliest editors than any preferences which may have asserted themselves in a later age.

xii.-1. where Dahse admits that *κύριος* stands for אֱלֹהִים, xxi. 2, 6; xxviii. 20 (he might at least have mentioned xix. 29, if not also xvii. 15, xxx. 17, xlvi. 9 [O.L.]). It is important for him to shew either that יהוה is the original Hebrew, or that *o theos* is the original LXX. I will not here pause to discuss the readings. It is enough to say that as regards xxviii. 20 he seems (pp. 96, 106) to make out a good case for יהוה as the original text; but as regards xxi. 2, 6 his reasoning (pp. 102, 111) appears to me utterly weak and inconclusive.

We come at last to the crucial test, a comparison of Dahse's theory with the facts that lie before us in the two texts, the Massoretic and the Greek. And here my observations are so opposed to Dahse's generalised statements that I find it necessary to visualise them, in order that the reader may see at a glance how the matter stands. In the following synopsis I register the occurrences of the names יהוה and אֱלֹהִים (J = יהוה, E = אֱלֹהִים) for each Seder in Genesis xii.-1., first according to the MT and then according to the LXX. The second line gives the readings of the larger Cambridge LXX, except in a few cases where another reading seems better attested; but in a third line I have noted those readings which are expressly claimed by Dahse as original. The material is taken from his own table, save in the few places where I have happened to detect an error. For the present I confine the examination to chaps. xii.-1., because in the first eleven chapters the frequent occurrence of the double name *κύριος o theos* in the LXX creates a special and complicated problem.

Par.	Seder.	Contains	Names.	Remarks.	
III (12 ¹ -17 ²⁷)	9	12 ¹⁻⁹	MT: } LXX: } J 6 times		
	10	12 ¹⁰ -13 ¹⁸	MT: JJJJJJJ LXX: EJEEEEJ ¹ *E	* ? 15 ⁴ (see Dah. pp. 102, 92 f.)	
	11	Ch. 14	MT: J LXX: -	14 ²² : Sam. E ²	
	12	Ch. 15	MT: JJJJJJJ LXX: JJJEEJE -- ? ?	15 ² (p. 13) 15 ⁴ (p. 102, 105) 15 ⁸ (p. 12 f.) 15 ¹⁸ p. 41, 109 f.)	
	13	Ch. 16	MT: JJJ-JJJJ LXX: JEJJJJJJ E	16 ¹¹ (p. 110, cf. p. 22, 32)	
	14	Ch. 17	MT: JEEEEEEEE LXX: JEEEEEEEE	17 ⁷ , ⁸ omitted	
	IV (18 ¹ -22 ²⁴)	15	Ch. 18	MT: JJJJJJJJJ LXX: EJJJJJJJ J J	18 ¹ , ¹⁴ (p. 92, 102)
		16	Ch. 19	MT: JJJJJJEE- LXX: JJJJJJJJEJ E E	19 ¹³ (? p. 110) 19 ^{20a} (p. 111)
		17	Ch. 20	MT: EEEEEJ* LXX: EEEEEJ	* 20 ¹⁸ : Sam. E
		18	Ch. 21	MT: JEEEEEEEEEEJ LXX: JJJ EJE EEEEEEEJ JE	21 ⁴ , ⁶ (? see p. 102, 111 f.)
19		Ch. 22, 23	MT: EEEEJEJJJJ*E LXX: EEEEJEJJJJ E ³	* Par. IV. ends here (22 ¹⁶)	

¹ One might have accepted J for the first E (12¹⁷), with Boh. OL, etc., but Dahse (p. 40) argues strongly for E.

² I agree with Dahse (p. 11) that the name is interpolated both in MT and Sam.

³ J only with "angel," "oracle," of Yahwe, and in the phrase "Yahwe-Yireh," where Dahse says (wrongly) it could not be altered.

Par.	Seder.	Contains	Names.	Remarks.
V (23 ¹ -25 ^{1a})	20	24 ¹⁻⁴¹	MT: JJJJJJJ LXX: JJJJJJJ E	24 ^{37a} & 24 ⁴⁰ omitted in D.'s table 24 ⁴⁰ Dah. οθς μου ? (p. 13, 103)
	21	24 ⁴²⁻⁶⁷	MT: } LXX: } J 6 times	
	22	25 ¹⁻¹⁸	MT: } LXX: } E once	
VI (25 ^{1a} -28 ²)	23	25 ^{1a} -26 ^{3a}	MT: JJJJJJJJJ LXX: JEJJJJJJJJ E	26 ^{3a} (Dah. ? p. 112)
	24	27 ¹⁻³⁷	MT: } LXX: } J 3 times ⁴	
	25	27 ^{38-28²}	MT: } LXX: } E twice	
	26	28 ^{10-29²⁰}	MT: EJJJEEJE ⁵ LXX: EJ-JEJJE	
VII (28 ¹⁰ -32 ³)	27	29 ^{31-30⁴¹}	MT: JJJJEEEEEE LXX: JJJJEEEEEE	28 ^{15b} added, * 28 ²⁰ . See p. 408. above
	28	30 ^{42-31³}	MT: EEEJJJ LXX: EEEEEJ *	
	29	31 ^{3-32³}	MT: JEEEEEE-JEEE LXX: JEEEEEEEEE-EE	
	30	32 ^{4-33¹⁷}	MT: JEEEE LXX: JEEEE	
VIII (32 ⁴ -36 ⁴³)	31	33 ^{18-35⁸}	MT: } LXX: } E three times	32 ¹⁰ added
	32	35 ^{9-36⁴³}	MT: E-EEEE LXX: EEEEE	
	33	Ch. 37	No divine names	
IX (ch. 37-40)	34	Ch. 38	MT: JJJ LXX: JEE	

⁴ Dahse (p. 103) seems to say that the middle name (27³⁰) was originally ο θς ου.

⁵ E only with "angels" or "house" of God.

⁶ On Par. VII. see the tables on p. 418 below.

Par.	Seder.	Contains	Names.	Remarks.
X (41 ¹ -44 ¹⁷)	35	Ch. 39, 40	MT: JJJJJEJJJE LXX: JJJJJEJJJE	
	36	41 ¹ -37	MT: } LXX: } E 5 times	
	37	41 ³⁸ -42 ¹⁷	MT: } LXX: } E 4 times	
	38	42 ¹⁸ -43 ¹³	MT: } LXX: } E twice	
	39	43 ¹⁴ -44 ¹⁷	MT: } LXX: } E twice	
XI (44 ¹⁸ -47 ²⁷)	40	44 ¹⁸ -46 ²⁷	MT: } LXX: } E 5 times	46 ^{1b} omitted
	41	46 ²⁸ -47 ³¹	No divine names	
XII (47 ³² -50 ²⁸)	42	Ch. 48	MT: } EEEEEEE- LXX: } EEEEEEE	
	43	Ch. 49, 50	MT: JEEE-E LXX: JEEEE	50 ¹⁷ omitted

I do not know whether Dahse will maintain that these statistics bear out his pericope-theory, or whether he will challenge them. If he elects for the latter alternative, there is certainly a whole jungle of problematical restorations of the original LXX in which he may take refuge, and through which it will be difficult for a non-expert critic to follow him. I will deal with some of his ventures in this field in other connexions; in the meantime I will only say that he has no right to make capital of our ignorance by subjective speculation as to what the original LXX *must* have been. His theory must be judged in the light of the textual data which we possess; and behind the readings best established as original no theorist is entitled to go. For it is not a readjustment here and there that will save this

theory, but a wholesale reconstruction on a scale which no sane scholar will either attempt or justify.

The plain truth is that between Dahse's observation of the facts and mine there are irreconcilable and sometimes unaccountable discrepancies. A good many of his generalisations appear to be simply loose and inaccurate. The number of "mixed" Sedarim is not 9 but 18; "mindestens *ein יהוה* = *κύριος*" (p. 92) being enough to constitute a mixed section. It is not true (p. 93) of Seder 26 that elsewhere than xxviii. 13a, 16 we have 'N = ο θεος, for there are two Js (xxviii. 20, 21) for the originality of which in the LXX Dahse has expressly argued (see above). The statement on p. 94 that Par. VI. has "at the beginning purely J-passages, and at the end three more," if true, would be fatal to the theory, and is contradicted on the next page; as a matter of fact the Parasha ends with two Es. In S. 16 it is not only the last, but the last two, names that are E in the MT. Ss. 17, 18, 19, even apart from "specially motivated passages," were not purely Elohistie in the LXX (see J in xxi. 1b, xxi. 2, xxi. 4 ?, xxi. 6 ?); and even if they had been they would have been none the less "mixed" by the presence of "motivated" Js, and there would have been nothing to prevent MT from regularly changing E to J. S. 10 has two Js (xiii. 4, 18), not "only one," as stated on p. 95. S. 23 is Yahwistic (p. 95) in MT, but not entirely so in the *older* (?) LXX form (xxv. 21b). S. 35 contains two Es; therefore is not Yahwistic (*ibid.*).—Other statements are justified only by operations on the text which seem to me doubtful and arbitrary. S. 12 is brought under the theory (p. 92) by no fewer than four changes of the text (xv. 2, 4, 8, 18), all precarious, and the last seemingly in opposition to what Dahse has himself said on p. 41. Similarly S. 13 is manipulated not only by the change of J to E in xvi. 11 (for which as the earliest *Septuagint* reading there

is a good deal to be said), but also by *neglecting* (nicht angeführt!) "fünfmal *αγγελος κ*" (p. 92), for which there is no real justification (see below). Chap. xviii. (S. 15) is excluded from the mixed Sedarim by twice changing E to J, on very weak evidence, amounting in the case of xviii. 1, even in Dahse's estimate, only to a "vielleicht" or a "wohl." Pars. VIII. and XII. are classed as Elohistie (p. 94) by explaining away the two Js (xxxii. 9 (10), xlix. 18) through the rule that "sacrifices, prayers and praises are offered only to Yahwe, not to Elohim" (p. 96), which again is an unreal restriction (see below). Indeed the variety of motives assigned for the retention of J by the LXX in particular cases is such as to discount heavily the value of a theory which requires to appeal to them all. And lastly it is an absolute *non sequitur* to argue (p. 93) that because there are "mixed" sections in the MT as well as in the LXX, therefore *all* the mixed Sedarim of the LXX must have been mixed in the Hebrew basis of that version. I do not profess to know all that Dahse may have had in his mind in writing these pages (92-95); but taking the statements as they stand I find them utterly untrustworthy and misleading. Probably few will take the trouble to check them in detail as I have done; but having done so I repeat that to the best of my judgment the facts are as I have given them above, and at any rate not as stated by Dahse. And I might fairly decline to debate a question on fundamental data which I conceive to be wrongly reported.

It is needless, then, to discuss minutely whether Dahse's theory fits the facts tabulated above; it manifestly does not. But I will point out one or two things. Taking first the recension supposed to lie behind the LXX, in the 14 "unmixed" Sedarim the rule is observed that the LXX has made no change on the original, and so far the theory may be said to be vindicated. Yes, but only on the assumption

that here the original text has been preserved by the Hebrew; otherwise we cannot tell what havoc the LXX may have made of sections originally mixed. Again, in the "mixed" Sedarim, it is true that there are only two (19 and 26) which do not either begin or end with J, and of these two it may be said that the first or last J of the original has been retained. I will not absolutely deny that there may be evidence of design here (though I greatly doubt it); but even if it be so it is quite as explicable on the supposition that the LXX is dependent on the MT as on the reverse assumption. I fear this is the only triumph that Dahse can claim for his hypothesis. In all other respects it is plain as day, from the synopsis above, that the treatment of the mixed Sedarim is governed by no principle whatever, unless it be the negative principle of making as few mistakes as possible.

Coming next to the alleged Massoretic recension, we find it encumbered with still greater difficulties. What is conceived to have taken place is a Yahwistic redaction, confined to mixed Sedarim, and applied to these only under peculiar conditions. It is of course possible to represent that the uniform use of J in six out of the eighteen originally mixed Sedarim (Nos. 10, 12, 13, 15, 23, 34) is due to an operation of this kind; but what of the remaining twelve? Dahse tells us that we are not to look for the alteration except in "Elohimstellen die mitten zwischen Yahweabschnitten lagen" (p. 94). The language is studiously ambiguous. What is a *Stelle*? what is an *Abschnitt*? If *Abschnitten* means Sedarim, the absence of the redaction in the majority of mixed Sedarim would no doubt be explained; but then the operation ought not to have been performed in any one of the six just enumerated. If, on the other hand, *Yahweabschnitten* are sections beginning or ending with an isolated J, the conversion of Nos. 10, 12 and 13 (not 15, 23 or 34)

would be accounted for, but its absence in other instances (e.g. Nos. 14, 17, 29) becomes inexplicable. Again, if *Elohimstellen* means (as apparently it must) individual occurrences of E within the Seder, the rule will be found to be frequently violated on both sides (Nos. 15, 16, 18, 19, 26, 28, 29, 35); and it rarely makes any difference to the working of the theory what position the names occupy in the Seder, or the Seder in the Parasha. It would seem, in fact, that the Parasha-division could only affect the treatment of the opening and closing Sedarim of the Parasha; of these it could never be said that they stand "mitten zwischen" J-sections. Now that consideration would have prevented the redaction in S. 34; and there are only three other cases (Nos. 14, 29, 43) in which it could have had any influence on such an editorial process as is here imagined. It is time to ask whether it be really conceivable that any man or body of men should have been governed by the whimsical notions attributed to the Massoretic editors. We could understand a systematic alteration of E to J throughout the Pentateuch; we could even understand such an operation being restricted to mixed Sedarim; but a Yahwistic redaction which refused to touch a mixed section unless it was flanked on both sides by the Tetragrammaton is too remote from the normal practical working of the human mind to be received as a credible explanation of the distribution of the divine names in the Hebrew text, even if it could shew a much closer correspondence with the facts than is actually the case. I submit then that no case has been made out for a Yahwistic redaction of the basis of the LXX by Hebrew editors governed by a regard to the Parashas. If there had been a redaction at all, the facts would be much more naturally explained by a tendency to assimilate isolated occurrences of E to the Js on either side of them, than by the complex system elaborated by Dahse.

And finally one would like to know why the MT is to be accepted as having preserved the original in the "unmixed" Sedarim, and to be regarded as secondary in the "mixed." Does not this amount to assuming that it is to be trusted when it tells in favour of the hypothesis, and discredited when it makes against it? ¹

We have not by any means exhausted the list of vaguely arbitrary statements for which Dahse makes himself responsible. I propose to follow him point by point through his analysis of Parasha VII (p. 95 ff.), which seems to have caused him more difficulty than any other in chaps. xii.-I. It extends from ch. xxviii. 10 to xxxii. 3, and includes Sedarim 26-29. He commences with what seems the irrelevant remark that no one has yet noticed how this Parasha begins and ends "artificially" with the "angels of God" (xxviii. 12; xxxii. 1). This statement is not quite correct. The last phrase is not in xxxii. 1, but in xxxii. 3, and it is not מלאכי אלהים but מנהג א'. Wherein the artificiality of the commencement and ending consists, and how the theory is affected by it, does not appear.—In xxviii. 13 he rejects the second J (with the LXX) as an interpolation in the Hebrew text. It makes no difference to the argument whether it be rejected or retained. But it is read not only by Hexaplaric MSS. of the LXX, and by the Sahidic and Ethiopic versions, but also (in place of *o theos*) by the Old Latin; so that it has a good claim to be regarded as the original reading of the LXX. We cannot, in view of xxvi. 24, say that the

¹ Even Dahse's own theory, untenable though it is shewn to be, works out in a manner eminently favourable to the MT. For in the first place it involves the admission, as we have seen, that in all unmixed Sedarim the MT has preserved the original names. Further, it implies that in mixed sections every J of the LXX must have stood in the original text, so that where MT and LXX agree in reading J, the MT is again true to the original. These two maxims between them account for about 126 names out of 216. Why should we suspect the soundness of the MT in the remaining 90 cases?

sense demands it ; but at least the sense is better with it than without.—In xxviii. 20 I have already admitted the force of his contention that J is the original reading (LXX, *κύριος ο θεος* or *κύριος*).—We come next to xxix. 31, 32 33, 35. Dahse allows that in all four instances J is the oldest attested LXX reading (as MT), but says he has already shewn that in the first three אלהים or אל is the original. Of v. 31 and 33 I can discover no previous discussion, and I see no reason for going behind the common tradition of MT and LXX. On v. 32 he has argued that the real form of the name of Jacob's eldest son Reuben (ראובן) "proves that יהוה cannot be original." I hope to deal with that type of argument in another connexion, and will only say here that it rests on a complete misconception. It is true, however, that the Peshitta here reads *Elohim*, and to that no answer can be made except that the Peshitta is much younger than the original LXX, and that a reading of that version unsupported by Greek evidence is no sufficient reason for questioning the soundness of the MT.¹ In v. 35 he allows that J is the true text, but on the inadequate and erroneous ground that it speaks of the "praise" of Yahwe, and that "one offers sacrifice, prayer and praise only to Yahwe, not to Elohim" (but see xx. 17, cf. xxii. 8, xxvii. 28).—Again, we have differences in xxx. 24, 27, 30. In v. 24 the textual evidence for E (against MT) is stronger than usual (LXX, Aquila, Symmachus, Peshitta); on the other hand all Hebrew MSS. and Sam. have J, which is the reading that naturally commends itself to those who believe on other grounds that two different explanations of the name Joseph are likely to have been derived from different sources. In v. 27 the LXX is supported by the Peshitta alone ; but

¹ On p. 27 we find the statement that xxii. 11, 15 are the only cases where a J of MT, rendered by E in Pesh., is translated by *κύριος* in the LXX. Dahse must have been nodding here.

Dahse adds the purely subjective consideration that Laban would not be likely to speak of the blessing of Yahwe! Why not? He does that very thing in xxiv. 31, where there is no dispute as to the text, and where (the Seder being "unmixed") J must, on Dahse's own theory, be regarded as original. In v. 30 he accepts J as original.—Lastly, on xxxi. 3–xxxii. 3 he declines to discuss xxxi. 49 because of the notorious corruptions of the text.—He adds the general remark that after "name" and "angel," Yahwe is always represented in LXX by *κυριου*. The former statement is true, but has no bearing on Par. VII, where the expression does not occur. The latter is incorrect (see Num. xxii. 22–35 *pass.*), and in any case it is clear from Gen. vi. 2, xxi. 17, xxxi. 11 that the LXX cannot have had any aversion to substituting E for J in this connexion. But let us adopt all these suggested amendments, and see how far the result bears out Dahse's theory. We have to distinguish three stages of the text: the original Hebrew; the original LXX (which proves to be almost identical with our present LXX); and the Massoretic text. We get the following scheme:—

Seder 26 (xxviii. 10–xxix. 30)	Orig. EJ-J E JJE
	LXX EJ-J E JJE
	MT EJJJEEJE
27 (xxix. 31–xxx. 21.)	Orig. EEEJEEEEEE
	LXX JJJJEEEEEE
	MT JJJJEEEEEE
28 (xxx. 22.–xxxi. 2)	Orig. EEEEEJ
	LXX EEEEEJ
	MT EEEJ J J
29 (xxxi. 3–xxxii. 3)	Orig. JEE ?EEEE? ?EE
	LXX JEEJEEEEEE?EE
	MT JEEEEEEE-JEEE

Compare this with Dahse's summary (p. 96):—

- “ Seder 26 is Elohistie, only the 1st (and connected there-
with the 3rd) name is J ;
,, 27 Beginning (xxix. 31 ff.) Yahwistic, then Elo-
histic ;
,, 28 Elohistie, the last name (xxx. 30) Yahwistic ;
,, 29 Beginning (xxxi. 3) Yahwistic, then Elo-
histic.”

It would seem that Dahse's generalisations are as wide of the mark as ever, and that after all these adjustments of the text he has come no nearer to a proof of his hypothesis. We note in particular (1) that the MT exhibits the tendency to substitute J for E only in three passages at most (xxx. 24, 27, xxxi. 49), while in two (xxviii. 20, xxxi. 11) it changes J to E, and in one (xxviii. 13b) it supplies J for a blank in the LXX. (2) That the LXX, in violation of its alleged principle, has three times changed an original E into J (xxix. 31, 32, 33). (3) That the characterisation of a Seder as “ anfangs jahwistisch, dann elohistisch ” is merely a device to save the theory by breaking up a mixed Seder into two unmixed sections. It holds good of S. 27 only *after* the LXX redaction, and therefore cannot be appealed to in explanation of the perfectly arbitrary treatment of the divine names in the LXX of this section. Further comment is superfluous.

I refrain, for the reason already given, from following Dahse through his discussion of the first eleven chapters. It is besides quite unnecessary to do so ; for if the theory breaks down (as I believe I have proved that it does) as regards chaps. xii.-1., it fails entirely. I will now ask the reader to dismiss it from his mind and to look once more at the tables given above to see what light they shed on the relations between the LXX and the Massoretic text. It will be found that in 23 out of the 35 Sedarim there is perfect agreement between the two texts ; that in 6 there is only

one divergence ; in four there are 2 ; and only in two are there so many as 3 and 5 respectively. In all, the divergences number 22 if we exclude cases where a name in one text stands for a blank in the other, or 30 if we include such cases. The total number of occurrences of Yahwe and Elohim in these 39 chapters is 211 in one text and 214 in the other. Here I venture to reaffirm the opinion expressed by me in the International Critical Commentary on Genesis (p. xxxv.), that that proportion of differences (from one-tenth to one-seventh of the whole) is not so great as to invalidate any critical conclusions properly deduced from the Massoretic text by itself ; and further, that the variations are quite adequately explained as accidental aberrations of the LXX, usually in the substitution of *o theos* for *κυριος*, but occasionally in the opposite direction. Let us only conceive (what the solid agreement of the Hebrew and Samaritan—differing, it will be remembered, only in some eight or nine cases—fully justifies us in assuming) that the MT has preserved the original names with substantial fidelity, and that the LXX is dependent upon it, and I think that any one not obsessed by a predilection for fine-spun theories and circuitous solutions will perceive that the facts are sufficiently accounted for in this simple way, as they certainly are not by the arbitrary and unintelligible pericope-hypothesis with which this article has dealt. It is really carrying a prejudice in favour of the LXX too far to throw the whole textual tradition into the melting-pot, and then to bring out “this calf.” I am not now discussing the merits of the documentary theory ; my concern is with the Massoretic text. But one remark may be made : whatever may be urged against the documentary theory of the Pentateuch it cannot be said that on textual grounds it is demonstrably false. I believe I have shewn that the pericope-theory of Dahse may be so characterised.

JOHN SKINNER.