

ARTICLE IV.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO A NEW THEORY OF THE
COMPOSITION OF THE PENTATEUCH.¹

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

II.

III.

THE present texts of the Pentateuch have been produced by the operation of several factors, and an acquaintance with these is often essential to the comprehension of difficult passages. No single topic can be exhausted on the consideration of one factor alone. We must therefore leave the conclusions of the preceding sections hanging for the present, and make a series of fresh starts in order to observe other influences that have been at work.

It is proposed to devote the present section to a consideration of glossing; but to do this fruitfully we must first ex-

¹This series was begun at a time when it was uncertain whether the writer would be called to the colors. It was accordingly planned on lines which would permit of intermission for an indefinite time. After the first article had been written, and while the second was in preparation, a calling-up notice arrived. This raised the question whether it would be better to publish some of the material that had been collected in a fragmentary form or to wait till after demobilization. On the whole it seemed desirable to proceed with publication, having regard to the possibility that the point of view and the new solutions of old problems might be of service to the neutral and other scholars who are known to be working on the Pentateuch; but the reader is requested to make the necessary allowances for the incompleteness of the work and the abnormal circumstances in which it has been prepared for the press.

amine the principle which must guide us in every part of the textual inquiry.

The great majority of Old Testament students have been content to rely in the main on our present Hebrew, the Masoretic text, abandoning its readings only when practically compelled to do so. Various considerations have been urged in favor of this course; such as, the habitual support of the Samaritan, the idea that it is "reasonable" to suppose this to be the best text, etc. Let it be clearly stated that this investigation entirely discards that point of view in favor of the principle of scientific textual criticism. The only possible basis for really scientific work is a critical text, and the dominant principle to be observed in the formation of such a text is so simple that everybody can grasp it. The function of scientific textual criticism is to recover that text from which all our existing evidence has been derived. If and in so far as the textual critic is unable to show how an existing reading has come into existence, he has failed in his task; and it is only fair to add that, in the present condition of Old Testament studies, failure must be the rule and not the exception. But it must be hoped that the work of the next two or three generations will reverse this.

The function of scientific textual criticism is to recover that text from which all our existing evidence has been derived. Let us examine this a little more closely. It means, first, that the critic should have all the extant evidence before him; and, secondly, that when he has completed his operations he should be able to point to the text which explains every single reading that we have, and show by what processes they have been derived from that text. The latter may or may not itself have been preserved in some existing authority. This ideal is very high and exacting. At present it

is utterly impossible of complete realization in any single passage; for the entirety of our existing evidence has not been made available, many thousands of minute and detailed investigations of all sorts of small points will be necessary before we can reach the best results attainable, and the coöperation of many minds equipped with the most varied attainments will be required. The work to be done ranges from labor that is almost mechanical to that highest form of scholarship which is retrospective prophecy. And even then complete success is unattainable, for in many thousands of instances the data will be indecisive and certainty impossible.

These considerations are depressing, but we must not allow them to paralyze our activities. The best way of insuring the fullest possible realization of the ideal at the earliest date is to show how much can be done with the evidence that is already available. Nothing could more efficiently stimulate the collection of what remains and the diversion of the necessary brain power to the tasks confronting the textual critic. But in our work we must always lay stress on the dominant principle. No text can be regarded as final unless we can see clearly that all the existing readings have been derived from it.

As a single illustration of the principle we may take a difficulty in Deut. xxxiii. 12. The Massoretic text there presents: "The beloved of the Lord shall dwell in safety, on him is a covering on him continually, and dwelleth between his shoulders." K 129, 298, 435, 436, omit the second "on him."¹ The Samaritan omits the first "on him," and reads "and is a covering." The Vulgate has "Amantissimus Domini habitabit confidenter in eo: quasi in thalamo tota die morabitur, et

¹ The readings of K 81 and 80 are mere copyists' errors and do not call for notice.

inter humeros illius requiescet," which points to a text that was either identical with the Massoretic or else omitted the second "on him." When we turn to the LXX, in place of the puzzling "on him is a covering on him," we find the following principal variants: (1) "And God is a covering on him"; (2) "And the Lord [variant, "the Lord God"] is," etc.; (3) ". . . will be a covering," etc.; (4) ". . . for him." (Small matters, such as evident Greek errors, are omitted.)

On this Driver (Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*) writes:† "Either with Sam LXX 'in safety: is a covering on him' [but Sam LXX 'and is a covering']; or (with Syriac) 'in safety: on him is a covering.'" It will be seen, first, that the evidence of the LXX is misrepresented; and, secondly, that neither of the readings recommended by Driver could possibly have given rise to all our existing texts. Both are awkward for lack of the subject. The true text appears to be:—

"The beloved of the Lord shall dwell in safety,
And his Master [Baal] is a covering for him [וְיָחַף לוֹ] continually,
And dwelleth between his shoulders."

In the Hebrew, "His Master" (בְּעַלָּיו) was deliberately mutilated to get rid of the offensive word. That left עָלָיו "on him." As this made no sense, it was thought to be a correction of "for him" (לֵו), which was accordingly altered. The different Hebrew and Samaritan readings express different results of this view, the word being sometimes found in both places, sometimes in only one or the other.

Further, וְ and וַ were indistinguishable, and בְּעַלָּיו חָפָה could also be read בְּעַלְיוֹ חָפָה or בְּעַלְיוֹ חָפָה, thus accounting for the future of some of the Greek texts and possibly for the Samaritan.¹ (That the future is wrong is shown by the

¹But וַ, "and," is so frequent an insertion that this view is not necessary.

rendering of כש by *κατεπαυσεν*, which proves that the LXX did not read כש at the end of the verse.) The LXX, on the other hand, goes back to texts that either contained Baal or else substituted unobjectionable expressions for it. Note, too, that the necessary subject is obtained, and all becomes clear. Here the conjecture exhausts the evidence, and is the only reading that can do so. Moreover, all the reasons for the formation of our existing texts become transparent.¹

Turning now from the general textual question to the study of glossing in particular, we find that our dominant principle gives rise to certain corollaries: "The function of scientific textual criticism is to recover that text from which all our existing evidence has been derived." Consequently, where there are two or more texts which differ merely in the presence or absence of certain words, we must see whether, on the one hand, their absence is due to one of the well-known causes of scribal error or MS. corruption or versional peculiarity; or whether, on the other hand, their presence is due to activities of glossators or some other source of error. It is customary to say that the shorter text is generally to be preferred. That is true, for there are far more instances of texts growing through glossing and other causes than of their being shortened. The longer text will, however, be preferable where the facts point to words falling out through homœography (homœoteleuton), or damage to a MS., or to deliberate shortening; and with experience it is frequently possible to tell whether this is the case. The shorter text will be preferable where it gives the same or a better sense in more elegant style, where the additional words correspond with the well-known habits of glossators or would naturally be evoked

¹For similar instances of theological mutilation, see BS, Oct. 1914, pp. 639 f.; Jan. 1915, pp. 103 f.

by the context, where they are traceable to some scheme or current of thought, or where they are clearly due to some other known source of error.

Now it happens that glossing antedates the archetype. This is easily proved by comparing the passages which occur twice in our texts and observing the presence of matter in one place which is absent in another.¹ In addition to these there are a number of passages of critical importance where, so far as the evidence before me goes, it would appear that the archetype contained glosses. The argument here may be stated as follows: We know from the extant evidence that there has been heavy post-archetypal glossing, and that the process of glossing antedates the archetype. Therefore, when we find that the archetype contains passages which bear all the marks of glosses and none of the marks of being part of the original work, we are as fully justified in inferring that they are glosses as the geologist who finds footprints on an old strand is justified in concluding that they were made by some animal.

In studying glossing it is frequently sufficient to take a passage by itself in the light of the textual evidence, but this is not always the case. It often happens that other related or unrelated passages throw light on the phenomena. An unrelated passage may afford valuable help by showing the habits of glossators. Related passages may show that a general scheme has been at work overlaying the original, of which, however, traces may survive now in one witness, now in another. The juxtaposition of the isolated testimonies of the dissentient witnesses may give the clue to the truth.

The ultimate effect of the study of the more important variants revealed by a comparison of the Septuagintal authorities Jerome and Kennicott with the Massoretic text of the Penta-

¹ See "First Steps in the Study of Glossing," *BS*, Oct. 1915.

teuch in the light of the dominant principle of scientific textual criticism is to produce the conviction that the amount of glossing in all texts has been enormous. There is no alternative, for it is impossible to suppose that every copyist and translator in turn abbreviated the text before him, and that the Massoretic text is always to be preferred whether it be the longer or the shorter, the clearer or the more obscure. While everybody who desires to have an independent grasp of the subject must of necessity examine a few chapters carefully for himself, it will be useful here to note some of the habits of Jewish glossators. The following paragraphs make no pretense of being exhaustive. They are intended simply to assist the reader in envisaging the problem that lies before the textual critic. It will be seen that the glossators made a fence about the Law in a very thorough manner—so thorough that they frequently fenced the Law out of sight.

The most elementary form of gloss is the expression of what is grammatically implied, e.g. the substitution of "A said" or "A said to B" or "he said to B" for "he said," the addition of "saying," etc. Here the glossator inserts subjects, objects, and the like that were implicit in the narrative.

The gloss of more precise definition is similar in thought. It defines more exactly the real or supposed meaning. Thus in Ex. xxxiv. 29 we read: "And it came to pass when Moses came down . . . *on his coming down from the Mount,*" but the Septuagintal MS. m and K 190 omit the italicized words. Similarly, in Gen. xii. 11, we have just read that Abram went down to Egypt, and we find "and it came to pass as he came down to enter into Egypt," but c₂ omits.¹ Again, the glossa-

¹ K 101 omits "he came down to enter"; K 129, "he came down." As so often happens, not quite the whole of the gloss has been incorporated in these texts.

tor will insert phrases like "on that day," "at that time," "this," etc. I have frequently called attention to such glosses.

A kindred idea shows itself in the supply of the necessary materials for performing the act contemplated. Is a man to wash? A glossator is at hand with water. Does he intend to write? A book is provided.

Glossators love to exhaust the act of the text. Hence "all" is a frequent addition.

The introduction of the complementary or incidental act belongs to the same circle of ideas. Thus if A is said to have gone, the glossator will be apt first to make him rise up; if he acted, he will often first be represented as going; if he ate, what more natural than to supply him with a drink?

Frequently we meet with the gloss of fulfillment. "So did he, as the Lord commanded X, so did he."

What in the glossator's view must have happened is frequently inserted. Thus at the end of Lev. xxiii. most texts have: "And Moses declared unto the children of Israel the set feasts of the Lord" (ver. 44), but K 83, 176, and b₂ omit, showing that this is an addition. Similarly in Lev. ix. 17, K 168 omits "besides the burnt offering of the morning," which had been independently recognized as a gloss (see B. D. Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien*, vol. iv., *Das Buch Leviticus*, p. 54).

The gloss of enumeration, the cataloguing of all possible objects, is very frequent. This is a natural form of legal commentary,¹ but is found in other cases too. If a man takes a journey, glossators are often in waiting to transport his family and belongings.

Supplementing from parallel passages is a well-recognized form of gloss, though the commentators through their neg-

¹ See BS, Oct. 1914, pp. 649 f.; Oct. 1915.

lect of the textual evidence have underestimated its extent enormously.

The above and many other kinds of glosses are all manifestations of a single idea. While a modern scholar would consider that he was doing the best for an ancient text in transmitting it as faithfully as possible, the old Jewish editor of the post-archetypal period clearly thought it his duty to make the text go as far as possible. He sought to 'enlarge torah' (Isa. xlii. 21). That was his tribute to its importance and sanctity; and, in order to form a critical text, we must reverse his mental processes.

Some other forms of glossing are more closely akin to the methods of modern commentators. Observations of all kinds were added to the text,—explanations, archæological, geographical, or historical notes, paraphrastic summaries, chronological data, and other matters of interest. Many of these have been recognized in modern editions and elsewhere.¹

Even more interesting are glosses that spring from later ideas; such as, the tendency to spiritualize the narrative, and the introduction of courteous phraseology.

All glosses necessarily have some importance, but not all are used as props of some theory of the origin of the Pentateuch. Speaking generally, it may indeed be said that the lists of words and expressions produced by the old documentary theorists in support of their hypothesis are largely due to the efforts of glossators. No textual critic would dream of taking those lists seriously. But many glosses have more critical importance.

Genesis xxviii. 7 is rightly omitted by p. On examination it is seen to be a mere marginal summary which has found

¹ On the whole subject, see further SBL, EPC, OP, PS, and BS, July and Oct. 1914, Jan. and Oct. 1915, *passim*.

its way into the text at an unsuitable point, where it interrupts the connection. Genesis xxiii. 20 is a similar note and is wanting in the Ethiopic. Genesis xxx. 28 is lacking in dp¹ and is clearly not original.

These instances are of relatively minor importance. Of somewhat greater consequence are such cases as the following:—

GENESIS XVI. 15.

M. T.

Text of gn.

And Hagar bare Abram a son and Abram called the name of his son, which Hagar bare, Ishmael.	And Hagar bare Abram a son and called his name Ishmael.
---	---

Here there are various intermediate texts. In omitting "Abram," gn are supported by m, bw, the Armenian, and Chrysostom;² in omitting "son," by p and Chrysostom; "which Hagar bare" is wanting also in pt and the Vulgate. Clearly the archetype of dpt originally agreed with gn.

This instance is important, because in the early narratives the name is generally, though not invariably, bestowed by the mother, not by the father. The glossators, however, were of a different opinion as to the propriety of this. A second example is to be found in Gen. xxi. 3, where, by a critical study of the variants, we can restore "And she called him [or, less probably, his name] Isaac," for "And Abraham called the name of his son that was born unto him, which Sarah bare to him, Isaac." As frequently happens in such cases, some portion of the glossing has got into every authority, but different parts are wanting in different texts.³

We can now return to the study of the colophons of Gene-

¹ On the group dpt, see especially BS, April, 1913, pp. 279-283.

² For our present purpose the evidence of Holmes and Parsons may be omitted.

³ In addition to the Greek variants we find that K 6 omits "that was born to him"; and K 185, "which Sarah bare to him."

sis at the point at which we had to abandon it in the last section.

"It is commonly held by writers on Genesis that the editor has marked the headings of the various sections by the formula אלה [ו] תולדות, which occurs eleven times in the book: ii. 4a, v. 1,¹ vi. 9, x. 1, xi. 27, xxv. 12, xxv. 19, xxxvi. 1, xxxvi. 9, xxxvii. 2. Transposing ii. 4a to the beginning and disregarding xxxvi. 9 (both arbitrary proceedings), we obtain ten parts; and these are actually adopted by Delitzsch as the divisions of his commentary. But the scheme is of no practical utility, — for it is idle to speak of xi. 10–26 or xxv. 12–18 as sections of Genesis on the same footing as xxv. 19–xxxv. 29 or xxxvii. 2–l. 26; and theoretically it is open to serious objection. Here it will suffice to point out the incongruity that, while the histories of Noah and Isaac fall under their own *Toledoth*, those of Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph fall under the *Toledoth* of their respective fathers" (Skinner, Genesis, p. xxxiv).

It will be remembered that we found that ii. 4a was a colophon, like the other colophons of the Pentateuch, and referred to what preceded. An earlier form was, "This is the book of genesis of the heavens and the earth." The expression "when they were created" is a gloss and is lacking in o, Arm-ed, and some patristic authorities. K 111, 166, omit "and the earth." The original colophon has probably grown. Genesis v. 1a is the next instance. But v. 1b, 2, appears to be mere glossing, based almost entirely on i. 26 ff. The statement "and he called their name Adam" is an explanatory gloss. Parenthetically we may observe that there is similar reminiscent glossing in v. 29. "From the ground which the Lord has cursed" is an obvious gloss, based on iii. 17. It is lacking in the Paris Bohairic and Cyr-ed. It is important to recognize that the seeming links between v. and the earlier chapters are merely due to glossators, for the textual evidence shows, as we shall see in the next section, that originally the patriarchal ages had no relation to the chronology of the flood.

זו ספר תולדות¹

In studying the next colophon we must take a group of passages together:—

1. Gen. vi. 10. "And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, Japhet." HP 31 omits the verse.
2. Gen. ix. 18. "And the sons of Noah who came out of the ark were Shem, Ham, and Japhet."
3. Gen. vi. 9. "These are the generations of Noah." d, omits; K 69, 191, omit "These are."
4. Gen. x. 1. "And these are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japhet, and sons were born to them after the flood."
 - (1) "And" 1° is omitted by bw, dp, f, Boh, Vulg, K 171.
 - (2) *Hic est liber generationum* Arabs 1, 2.
 - (3) K 111, 247 omit "sons." They are supported by a MS. of the Vulgate quoted by a Louvain editor and some other Vulgate authorities (see Vercellone *ad loc.*).
5. Gen. x. 32. "These are the families of the sons of Noah." *Vulgate Hæ familiæ Noe*, Jerome's Hebrew verity having evidently lacked the word "sons."

When these variants are compared the story becomes clear. Obviously the generations heading in vi. 9 arose from glossing. Its insertion made nonsense of the text of x. 1, which was originally a colophon, like ii. 4a, v. 1a, relating to the foregoing story of Noah.¹ To remedy this the word "sons" was inserted in x. 1, 32, but in each case some of our authorities have remained unaffected. "The book of origin of Noah" was originally a colophon, like "the book of origin of man," and the phrase in practice meant little more than "this is the story of Noah." Genesis x. 32, now glossed, was the colophon of Gen. x. Further glossing was responsible for the triplication of the information (original in ix. 18) as to the three sons. Skinner was right in pointing to the anomaly revealed by the *toledoth* sections.

In Gen. xi. 27, E dp c g l r Eth omit: "These are the generations of Terah; and Terah begat Abram and Nahor and

¹ Genesis ix. 29 is wanting in K 109, 390, 440, 567, 574, 622.

Harran." Familiarity with Septuagintal criticism makes it certain that the consensus of these authorities on such a point represents an early pre-Hexaplar text. Is the variant due to homœography? No, for the half verse is merely a repetition (such as cannot be attributed to an original author) of the statement in the preceding verse, with the addition of the generations formula. Hence it is a gloss.

While I cannot at present offer proof, I may say that, in my judgment, there are in Genesis the remains of two other colophons which were mistakenly treated as headings. The first relates to Abraham, and has now become in the Massoretic text xxv. 19: "And these are the generations of Isaac, Abraham's son." The section as to the generations of Ishmael, who had been finally dismissed from the original narrative at a much earlier period, appears to me to be the work of a commentator, and I had hoped to examine critically the readings of bw in this and some other passages. Further, I think that when the transition from library to scroll took place, xxvi. was misplaced because it was thought natural that the story of the birth of Isaac's children should follow the narrative of his marriage as closely as possible. But Rebekah is obviously younger in xxvi. than in xxv.

The other colophon (in mutilated form) is now in xxxvii. 2a and completes the Jacob story (as contrasted with the Joseph story, in which the patriarch is merely a subordinate character). I hold that the two sections as to the generations of Esau (xxxvi. 1-5 and 9-43) are also due to commentators, and I believe that in xxxv. 27 the Paris Bohairic has retained the right reading: "And Jacob came unto *Esau, his brother.*" The original text probably placed xxxvi. 6 f. (in a shorter form revealed by the textual authorities) immediately after xxxv. 27. Then came xxxvi. 8a, with which

xxxvii. 1 was continuous: "And Esau dwelt in Mount Seir, but Jacob dwelt," etc. This was followed by the colophon "This is the book of origin [=story] of Jacob." But detailed discussion is at present impossible.

It may be that other colophons have perished through damage to the "library." Presumably colophons were originally used because the books of early days were stored in such a way as to make their use convenient for purposes of reference. They may have been written on exposed portions of the books or even labels, and would consequently have been particularly liable to damage.

The subjects of rewriting and lengthy commentary must be left over for future sections, but attention should be drawn to some further critical bearings of glossing.

It is well known that the Flood narrative exhibits great textual variations. We have been promised studies of it by Dahse and Olmstead and it must be hoped that these will appear soon. Without desiring to forestall these scholars I find myself compelled by the importance of the subject to point to the differences in Gen. viii. 1-5 as an example of what may be expected. To appreciate them correctly the character of the Vienna Genesis, cited as L, must be borne in mind. It is not a complete text, but a kind of illustrated epitome.¹ It is often impossible to tell whether a given omission is due to the exigencies of space or to the character of the text followed by the epitomizer. Where, however, any other authority confirms L, or where there are strong internal reasons for preferring its text, we may assume the latter to be the correct explanation. This is particularly the case

¹ See *Die Wiener Genesis* herausgegeben von Wilhelm Ritter von Hartel und Franz Wickhoff. Beilage zum xv und xvi Bande des *Jahrbuches der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*.

with viii. 2. To shut the fountains of the deep and the windows of heaven, which had previously been opened in the author's narrative, is precisely what a glossator would love to do. But the author himself might perform the task; and, so long as the omission rested on the authority of L alone, it would be hazardous to adopt it. But K 75 also omits the verse, and, in view of its character, it may safely be rejected.

In the following table the shortest Septuagintal text is that which may be obtained by rejecting all the words that are lacking in any Septuagintal authority other than or in agreement with L, and (in ver. 2) by L and K 75.

GENESIS VIII. 1-5.

M. T.	Shortest Septuagintal Text.	L.
1 And God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the cattle that were with him in the ark: and God made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters assuaged.	1 And God remembered Noah, and all with him in the ark: and God made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters assuaged.	1 And God made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters assuaged.
2 The fountains also of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and the rain from heaven was restrained.	2 Vacat.	2 Vacat.
3 And the waters returned from off the earth continually, and after the end of an hundred and fifty days the waters decreased.	3 And the waters returned continually, and decreased for a hundred and fifty days.	3 Vacat.
4 And the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat.	4 The ark rested on the mountains of Ararat.	4 And the ark rested on the mountains of Ararat.
5 And the waters decreased continually until the tenth month: in the tenth month, on the first day of the month, were the tops of the mountains seen.	5 And the waters decreased and the tops of the mountains were seen.	5 [L here omits a passage of some length.]

On these facts different minds will reach different conclusions, and the peculiar character of L justifies doubt. It must be hoped that fresh evidence may soon be produced which will settle the readings. Personally I suspect that in verse 1 L's text is right; for (1) the repetition of "God" cannot be original, so that if 1a were genuine, we should probably find some Septuagintal text omitting the word in 1b; and (2) 1a might very well be a theological glossator's note. So, too, verse 3 looks like the work of a man who considered that the one hundred and fifty days' increase of vii. 24 should be balanced by a like decrease, though in the Massoretic reading even this idea is abandoned. The text of L in verses 1 and 4, combined with the short version of 5, is simple and stately and well worthy of the original author.

Glossing from parallel passages is responsible for a number of the apparent doublets. Thus, in Ex. xvii. 7, "and Meribah" is omitted by Jerome. It is plainly due to a remembrance of Num. xx. Elsewhere the place is called "Massah" only.

Similarly, in Gen. xxvi. 33, we find a place called *שבעה*. The first letter can be read as *ש*, giving an otherwise unknown word, or as *ב*, in which case the word means "abundance." Even so strong a supporter of the Massoretic text as Skinner, after enumerating some of the ancient Versions that have the latter reading (to which add Arm-codd), "is tempted to agree with them." But he has failed to see that, if they are right, the rest of the verse is merely a mistaken gloss, and cannot be part of the original narrative.

In xxxv. 10 we find the following text in the LXX: "And God [D h dt f c, Sah Eth Chr K 13 omit "God"] said to him [h omits "to him"], Thy name shall no longer be called Jacob [there are numerous variants], but Israel shall be thy

name [wanting in Eth]." The verse has nothing whatever to support it in the context. There is no reason for a change of name. But if we turn to xxxii. 29 (28) we find that the verse is a mere repetition of the common Septuagintal text of that passage (which is itself shown by the variants to be heavily glossed). A glossator, finding a theophany here, scribbled a note supplementing the account by a reference to the change of name on a former occasion, and so gave rise to our texts.

Glossing that was unimportant in extent has introduced some geographical puzzles. We have seen that the transition from library to scroll gave rise to grave derangements of the true sequence of the narrative. Hence a geographical gloss based on the present order might be totally erroneous. Thus in Ex. xvii. 8 the battle with Amalek is located at Rephidim, but HP 30 omits "in Rephidim." If the expression is only a gloss based on the position of this narrative in the scrolls of the law, we have no knowledge of where or when the battle was fought. Similarly Num. xiii. 26 (27) places Kadesh in the wilderness of Paran, but "wilderness" is lacking in dpt, and "Paran" in n*. Probably a glossator who relied on the present erroneous order (see EPC, pp. 114-138, Num. xii. 16 [xiii. 1]) is responsible for this geographical conception.

IV.

Textual corruption of various kinds has played a considerable part in increasing the difficulties of the Pentateuch. We have to take account not merely of unavoidable accident, but also of emendations in the wrong direction. There appears to have been a time when an editor finding a text that appeared to him to be obviously wrong would alter it to what seemed to him to be right, and his ideas of right and wrong

were not always identical with those of the original author. I had hoped to make a fairly large collection of such cases, so as to have some idea of their extent; but in present circumstances I am compelled to limit this section to a few instances. Pending further investigation I may say that my impression is that the amount of actual corruption is small, but that it has created a disproportionate number of *crucis interpretum*.

On former occasions attention has been drawn to some passages in which the Hebrew has become unintelligible through the accidental corruption of one or more letters; e.g. in Ex. xviii. 6 "I" for "behold"; xix. 22, "priests" for "elders"; Num. xvi. 1, "took" for "waxed presumptuous." But there are cases where our present Hebrew reads perfectly well so far as the grammar and some kind of sense are concerned, but other authorities show alternative readings. All these ought to be collected and studied in the light of the principles of scientific textual criticism.

A curious instance occurs in Num. xxii. 5. Balaam is supposed to have come from a city called Pethor. In Deut. xxiii. 5 (4) the Massoretic text has "from Pethor," but the expression is lacking in both LXX and Vulgate. In the Numbers passage the LXX supports the Massoretic reading, but Jerome reads פתור, which he renders *ariolum* for פתורה. He is joined by other ancient authorities (see Vercellone *ad loc.*, and add that, in his Liber de Nominibus Hebraicis, Jerome expressly gives Fethora as *apud* LXX).

The difficult dialogue in Ex. xxxii. f. provides some striking examples. In xxxii. 30, for "on the morrow," we find bw presenting "after the plague." I have not had time to get to the bottom of this discrepancy. In xxxiii. 5 the Massoretic text reads: "If I go up into the midst of thee for one moment, I shall consume thee," but the LXX was very dif-

ferent. Taking the text of B only as being sufficient for the matter in hand, we have: "See that I do not bring another plague on you and consume you." The common origin can be detected at a glance, for

רנע אחר = one moment.

ננע אחר = another plague.

Seemingly MS. damage destroyed the "see lest," and injured the ך, leading to a misreading of the ך as ך, and consequential emendation of the now unintelligible remains of the text.

Sometimes such consequential emendations appear to have been made on glosses that had got into the text. Thus, in Gen. xlix. 31, B reads: "There they buried Abraham and Sarah his wife: there they buried Isaac [note "they," not "we"] and Rebekah his wife: there they buried Leah." That is an obvious enough gloss. But the Massoretic text, making it a part of Jacob's speech (though forgetting that in xxxv. 29 it has made him a party to the burial of Isaac), alters to "I buried Leah." Similarly, in Ex. xxxii. 14, we read: "And the Lord repented of the evil which he said he would do unto his people." If this is genuine, the following narrative and dialogue are unintelligible, for what could be the purpose of the prolonged intercession if God had already relented? But on turning to the LXX we find traces of an earlier "Repent, O Lord," etc., i.e. originally this verse was merely an accidental repetition of the end of verse 12. When it was taken into the text at this point, a consequential alteration was required to smooth the narrative.

Some readings appear to be emendations made as the result of a wrong theory. In Lev. ix. the Massoretic text burns certain offerings twice over, once in the ordinary way and later with fire from heaven, but the LXX merely places them

in readiness in the earlier passages. The Greek is right, and the changes are due to somebody who thought that the usual practice must have been followed, failing to understand that the whole point of the narrative is that, at the end of a period of progressive hallowing of altar and priesthood, the Divine acceptance and ratification of the process were signified by the descent of fire from heaven.

Other readings can only be attributed to emendations resulting from the change from library to scroll. We have already seen instances of this in the alteration of the colophon "this is the book of origin" into the title "these are the generations." Another very clear example occurs in Ex. xxv. 9.

"In Ex. xxv. 40, xxvi. 30 and xxvii. 8, Moses is not in the mount. He was there or shall go there, according to the translation of the verb as Perfect or Exact Future. 'And see that thou make them after their pattern, which *has been shewed* thee in the mount (or will have been shewed thee).' Obviously Moses is not in the mount as this is said to him" (B. D. Eerdmans, Expositor, Seventh Series, vol. x. [1910] p. 322; cp. Alttestamentliche Studien, vol. iii. Das Buch Exodus, pp. 100 f.).

Contrast the Massoretic text of xxv. 9, "according to all that I *shew* thee." Yet Eerdmans is confirmed by xxv. 16, "the testimony which I will give [or "was giving"]." The difficulty is emphasized by the attempt to defend the present position. Thus Carpenter, following Kuenen, writes: "The perfects . . . may be fairly interpreted as *futura exacta*," when Moses has descended from the mountain he is to conform to what "will have been revealed to him" (Hexateuch, vol. ii. p. 120). This is far too subtle. In an order to X to do what he is *being* commanded, the language used would not be, "what you *shall have been* commanded."

The Massoretic text is, however, not the only reading in xxv. 9. The vital words are "I show thee." The variants are:—

1. "I shall show thee *in the mount.*" Arm, Boh, with some support from Cyril.
2. "I show thee *in the mount.*" Sam, K 69, LXX (except, as above, with immaterial variants. The Old Latin has "*this*" mount.
3. "I shall show thee." Vulg.

K 9 has מראה over an erasure.

We must remember that the four other passages show clearly that these commands were not given on the mount, and that the expression "in the mount" would be out of place if Moses had been there at the time. If anything at all were inserted, it should naturally have been "here" or "now." Clearly the first is the original reading, and the variants arose after the verses had come into their present place, because the language was felt to be incompatible with a position on the mount.

There is, of course, not the slightest reason for supposing that the instructions as to the Tabernacle were originally intended to form part of a continuous narrative. They were extremely technical in character, and were doubtless designed to be separate "books." Hence it is useless to try to fit them into Ex. xxiv. The difficulty is merely one that resulted from the change from library to scroll.

A further instance of textual change is revealed by the Sahidic variant in Num. xx. 23. It places Mount Hor at the border not of Edom, but of Moab. I have shown elsewhere (EPC, pp. 114-138) that the death of Aaron did not take place on the western side of Edom, but, in ignorance of the Sahidic reading, I had supposed it to have occurred on the eastern. This variant, however, is clearly the earlier text. It is easy to see

that Moab would be altered to Edom as the result of the present position of the narrative, but impossible to suggest any reason for the reverse process. It is gratifying to find the reconstruction of these chapters thus confirmed by fresh textual evidence, even as it has been confirmed from another side by the testimony of archæology.

The numbers in Gen. v. appear to have been affected by a somewhat similar cause, though I have seen no ground for regarding the bulk of this chapter as a constituent of any of the early books. In the following table the readings of the Massoretic text, the Samaritan, and A (other Septuagintal authorities in the case of Methuselah whose numbers have been altered in A) for the last four of the nine pre-Noachite patriarchs are shown:—

	AGE AT SON'S BIRTH.			REST.			TOTAL.		
	Heb.	Sam.	LXX	Heb.	Sam.	LXX	Heb.	Sam.	LXX
Jared	162	62	162	800	785	800	962	847	962
Enoch	65	65	165	300	300	200	365	365	365
Methuselah	187	67	167	782	653	802	969	720	969
Lamech	182	53	188	595	600	565	777	653	753

Hebrew variants may mostly be explained by homœography; but in verse 28 (Lamech) K 176 has 172 followed by 772 in verse 31, thus making Lamech die in the year of the flood, and K 18 seems to have had 909 in verse 31. Of Septuagintal readings we must notice the 148 given by the Sahidic in verse 28 as Lamech's age at the birth of Noah, and the fact that there are several readings in 31 (Lamech's total).

Apart from the above, the Samaritan regularly agrees with the Massoretic numbers in this chapter, and the LXX regularly adds one hundred years to the age of the father at birth, subtracting them from the rest.

On this Professor John D. Davis writes:—

"Readers of the Sept noticed that according to its data Methuselah survived the flood, and in order to avoid this incongruity a scribe changed the 167 years ascribed to his age at the birth of his son, to 187 years. This reading was early in existence, and was followed by Jos. Holding the same theory regarding the genealogy, the Samaritans noticed that by their data three men, Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech, survived the Flood. To correct the apparent mistake, without tampering with the age of these men at parenthood, their longevity was reduced sufficiently to enable them to die in the year of the Deluge. If the Heb text in its present form is not original, and is to be amended from the Sam and Sept, the same difficulty inhered in it. To overcome this difficulty, perhaps, 100 years was borrowed from the years that elapsed between parenthood and death and were added to the age of the three men at the time of begetting a son. This relieved the matter as far as Jared was concerned and perhaps in the case of Lamech also, and the borrowing of an additional 20 years set Methuselah right also" (ISBE, pp. 139 f.).

It appears to me impossible to escape from these conclusions. In the case of Lamech the variants suggest that the difficulty of adjusting the matter was greater.

These facts would naturally call for further consideration in any discussion on the amount of commentary on the original writings that was embodied in the edition represented by the archetype.¹

¹After careful consideration of various attempts to construct chronological systems on the basis of our different witnesses, I have reached unfavorable conclusions.

1. No discussion that I have seen even begins to explain the phenomena. In Gen. v. the formula runs, 'And A lived x years, and begat B: and A lived after he begat B y years . . . and all the days of A were $x+y$ years. No explanation that completely ignores y and $x+y$ (i.e. $\frac{2}{3}$ of the formula) has any claim to be regarded as a solution. At most it *may* represent a theory formed by some Jewish circle operating with a number of data *that were already in existence*. The archetypal texts of Gen. v. and xi. were certainly not the results of any theory of the kind suggested by modern writers.

2. We know that at least three chronologies prevailed in Jewish circles, — those of the Massoretic text, the original LXX, and the Samaritan in so far as it is supported by Jubilees. The Syriac

Other alterations seem to have taken place after the admission of erroneous glosses to the text. A telltale instance occurs in Gen. 1. In verse 11 we read of Abel-mizraim. Omitting variants that do not affect the matter under consideration, we have three different accounts:—

p	B	M. T.
12 And the children of Israel did thus to him, as he commanded, and buried him there.	12 And his sons did thus to him and buried him there.	12 And his sons did unto him according as he commanded them;
13 Vacat.	13 And his sons carried him up into the land of Canaan, and buried him in the cave, etc.	13 And his sons carried him up into the land of Canaan, and buried him in the cave, etc.

Clearly the archetype buried Jacob at Abel-mizraim; the glossator, in the cave. B gives both versions; p, the earlier, while M. T. represents a still later stage than B, incorporating the gloss, and omitting the portion of the earlier text that appeared to conflict with it.

The last class of textual alteration which can be noticed here is perhaps the most interesting of all. The text of the Pentateuch has been judaized, i.e. readings have been adopted which owe their origin to later Jewish ideas of what was right and proper. The best-known instances are the divine reading 75 for 70 in xi. 26 (Terah), and some of the variations of the Septuagintal authorities may point to yet other schemes. In these circumstances it would seem to be a mistake to attach too much importance to the hypotheses that have been propounded.

3. Many moderns try to prove one of our texts to be original. I am bound to say that in my judgment all have suffered from attempts to remove a difficulty that inhered in the archetypal form of Gen. v., viz. that the figures relating to three of the nine patriarchs before Noah involved their surviving the flood. In other words, the original numbers had no relation to the present flood chronology or the modern theories that are dependent on it.

4. The textual variants show that the different items in the chronology belong to different ages (see BS, July, 1916, Oct. 1917).

appellations and other alterations made either in obedience to the supposed commands contained in Biblical texts or through the effort to remove anthropomorphisms, etc. But they do not stand alone. Thus in Num. xx. 29 the Massoretic text makes the period of mourning for Aaron thirty days; but the Latin and Lagarde's Bohairic have forty, and in the case of Moses (Deut. xxxiv. 8) there is a similar variation, t offering forty for the Massoretic thirty. The reason is not far to seek. Thirty days is a Jewish period of mourning; forty, in the old texts, an indefinite expression of number meaning simply "many." Thus while the original statement was "many days," the period that was correct, according to Jewish ideas, has been particularized.

I greatly suspect that one of the most inveterate of the difficulties of our Pentateuch, the confusion between Dwelling and Tent of Meeting, which are sometimes distinguished and sometimes used interchangeably, is due to a similar cause; but as I have not had time to make the necessary investigation, I can only put my idea forward very tentatively. In Ex. xxv. 8 we read: "And let them make me a sanctuary: that I may dwell among them." For "dwell," שָׁכַנְתִּי (š), the LXX presents *ὀφθῆσομαι*, "I shall be seen." That does not represent a different Hebrew, for the Septuagintal translators abhorred anthropomorphisms and had carefully avoided one in the preceding chapter. They would certainly not have rendered such a Hebrew text baldly, even if we could suppose it probable on other grounds. The translation is due to the doctrine of the "Shechinah," the Divine dwelling, presence, or appearance.¹ "The Tabernacle was erected in order that the Shekinah might dwell on earth (Num. R. xii.); and it

¹ Compare the LXX rendering in Deut. xxxiii. 16, τῷ ὁδοῦντι ἐν τῷ βῶνι, "who appeared in the bush."

actually entered the Holy of Holies (Sanh. 103b)" (L. Blau in Jewish Encyclopedia, *s.v.* Shekinah). It is easy to understand that such a doctrine might influence editors in favor of *Mishkan*, "dwelling."

v.

It is now possible to outline a satisfactory explanation of the difficulties connected with the Tabernacle chapters.

The concluding chapters of Exodus are not original: xxxv. 4–xl. exist in a different form in the LXX. While the half-shekel tax in xxx. 11–16 is dependent on the census, it is utilized in xxxviii. 25 ff. for the construction of the Tabernacle, i.e. *before the census was taken*. In the earlier passage it is to be used for the *service* of the Tent of Meeting, in the later it is applied to its construction. According to Deut. x. 3 the ark was made *before* the second ascent of the mount.¹ This conflicts with these chapters, but is in perfect harmony with the library theory. The tabernacle instructions were not intended to form part of a continuous narrative, and damage to the library was the original cause of the mischief. It caused a sensible gap, and an effort was made to fill it. This was a chief reason of the composition of Ex. xxxv. 4–xl. This view is strongly confirmed by the fact that Num. vii. 89 appears to be a fragment of a narrative relating the fulfillment of Ex. xxv. 21 f. We have seen that it can be understood only as a carefully preserved part of a dam-

¹ "Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and come up unto me into the mount and make thee an ark of wood . . . and I made an ark of acacia wood" (Deut. x. 3). This is quite consistent with Ex. xxv. 10 ff. (if "thou shalt make" of LXX, Sam, is the correct reading in ver. 10), but it requires the manufacture of the ark to have been put in hand before the ascent. Probably the text of Ex. xxxiv. once contained such instructions and has suffered.

aged MS. which originally contained an account of the execution of the commands in Ex. xxv. ff.

Once this is recognized, a solution comes into view. That Ex. xxv. ff. are heavily glossed is evident from the LXX; but, subject to this and the discarding of the order, there appears to be no extraordinary difficulty. The altar of incense (Ex. xxx. 1-10) affords some valuable clues.

The fundamental idea is extremely simple. The lighting arrangements would require attention every morning and evening; but holiness, as Nadab and Abihu discovered, is a very dangerous quality, and unless the priest who attended to the light were protected by a veil of smoke he might be struck dead. To provide this protective smoke, incense was to be burnt within the tabernacle during the performance of these duties, and for this purpose an altar is provided. The whole object and the sole use of this altar were in connection with the lighting arrangements. It was not to be used, and could not conveniently be used, elsewhere than its proper place. Consequently for entering the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement a censer was carried.

Once a year certainly (possibly, but not probably, also on other occasions, in the event of defiling sin of the anointed priest or the whole congregation), unsinning with blood was necessary. Therefore it is provided that the altar of incense should be so unsinned (Ex. xxx. 10; Lev. iv. 7, 18 probably).

A comparison of the provisions of Ex. xxx. 1-10 and Lev. xvi. shows, however, that the Exodus passage presupposes the chapter of Leviticus. One fact is decisive. In Ex. xxx. 10 Aaron is to unsin the altar with the blood of the sin offering of atonement; but in Leviticus xvi. 14 this is not mentioned. The inference is that originally Ex. xxx. 1-10 was

legislation given at a date subsequent to Lev. xvi., which, in turn, is dated (ver. 1) after the death of the two sons of Aaron. There is no discrepancy between the two passages if the order is Ex. xxx. 1-10, Lev. xvi., but in the present arrangement their relation is unintelligible. A presumption arises that this arrangement does violence to the historical facts, and that we should really not regard all the construction commands as having been given or executed simultaneously, but rather consecutively. There are other indications of this, for we have seen that Deuteronomy testifies to an early date for the making of the Ark, and there is some slight evidence as to the lighting.

We saw that Ex. xxvii. 20 f. appeared to be an insertion, based on Lev. xxiv. 2 f., made for the sake of completeness. When we compare Num. viii. 2 f., which, while not now in an intelligible form, clearly contained some instructions as to lighting, the most probable conclusion seems to be that some, at any rate, of the regulations on this matter were given at a relatively late date. In other words, I think that the Tabernacle commands were really spread over a period of time, and that the lighting arrangements and the golden altar were probably among the last. The latter was not indispensable, for it was possible (though less convenient) to produce the necessary protective smoke in censers. Indeed, it may be that the original intention was to use censers, and that the deaths of Nadab and Abihu led to a change. In the Mosaic period new law was regularly enacted to meet new circumstances (see, e.g., Lev. xxiv. 10-24; Num. ix. 6 ff.; xviii. 1-7; xxvii. 1-11; xxxvi.). The references to the altar of incense in two catalogues (Ex. xxx. 28; xxxi. 8) conflict with this view, but appear to be due to glossators.

Now in inquiries of this character there is always dan-

ger of being unable to see the wood for the trees, and it is therefore important to lay stress on the fact, that, whatever difficulties of detail may be caused by the present condition of a text that has been transmitted for over three thousand years, there can be no doubt at all about the essential unity of the scheme of the whole legislation. The fundamental conceptions are expressed time after time, a holy God dwelling among a holy people. "And there I will meet with the children of Israel; and the Tent shall be sanctified by my glory. And I will sanctify the tent of meeting, and the altar: Aaron also and his sons will sanctify, to minister to me in the priest's office. And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God. And they shall know that I am the Lord their God, that brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them: I am the Lord their God" (Ex. xxix. 43-46). These ideas lie at the root of the whole legislation. But unity of scheme does not guarantee simultaneity either of drafting or of execution any more than it can protect a text from the ordinary incidents of MS. transmission. Hence I think that the phenomena point to some such view as the following:—

The commands as to the Tabernacle and similar matters formed a part of a single plan and were reduced to writing by Moses. But the drafting of these laws and their execution were alike a gradual process. Thus we know that the ritual of the Day of Atonement was not committed to writing till after the death of Nadab, though doubtless the institution, with some such ritual as that prescribed, had always formed an integral part of the scheme and was contemplated in other portions of the legislation. Further, it may be, though this is not certain, that in the light of events some developments (such as the altar of incense) were introduced.

This legislation and an account of its execution formed part of the Mosaic library, being embodied in short writings on skins or whatever the material used. They underwent considerable damage and in some cases only fragments remained. When a book scroll was produced from the extant remains of the library, no earlier position could be found for the beginning of the tabernacle writings than the termination of the ascent of Moses into the mount, for it had been no part of the original intention that these writings should be embodied in the main historical narrative. Nor could they be placed later, for the reference to the receptacle for the testimony to be given in the future could not be made subsequent to the giving of that testimony. Hence the resultant present position, and partly by accident, partly by design, a number of other laws relating to the sacred impedimenta and other matters were placed after them. Editors then inserted such passages as Ex. xxix. 30-42 from mistaken ideas of completeness, and attempts were made to supply the loss of the narrative of which Num. vii. 89 is a fragment, thus giving us the concluding chapters of Exodus in some form. Heavy glossing added to the bulk of the legislation, and obscured some of its original features, and the text was influenced by the causes noted in the last section, and perhaps some others.

Naturally this outline requires to be filled in and corrected by further research, but it may serve as an indication of the directions in which we should look for light on the formation of our present text.