

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

CONTRIBUTIONS TO A NEW THEORY OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE PENTATEUCH (III.)

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

VI

IN the preceding articles¹ we saw reason to believe that the Pentateuch had at one time consisted of a library of small writings which underwent damage and derangement and were subsequently incorporated in scroll form. Editorial efforts to remedy matters tended to increase the confusion, and, combined with glossing, longer commentary, and the natural deterioration of a MS. text, helped to produce the state of affairs with which we are familiar. It was suggested that one of the methods to which editors might have resorted was rewriting.

In the interval which has elapsed since the publication of the second of these papers, a controversy has arisen about the date of the Exodus,² in the course of which it was said that the question of the itinerary of Num. xxxiii. would be examined after the writer's demobilization. That promise it is now proposed to redeem.

The Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch throws considerable light on methods that were adopted in the editorial age; and, in considering any one of these, we have to ask ourselves, whether it was peculiar to the Samaritans, or whether they merely applied a mode of procedure that was or had been in vogue among the Jews. We have had several instances in which the latter proved to be the case. Glossing is common to both texts, and a comparison of the two often reveals on which side the expansion lies. The Samaritans are famous for their additions to

¹ BS for January and April, 1918.

² See BS, Oct. 1918.

the texts of earlier books from Deuteronomy and parallel passages (as also to the text of Deuteronomy from the earlier books), and we found that in Num. xxi. 33-35 the Massoretic text shared their addition, which, however, was wanting in the Old Latin, and consequently in the Hebrew original of the LXX. We discovered that Ex. xxx. 1-10 was not in its proper position in our Hebrew; and, when we meet with it after xxvi. 35 in the Samaritan, we recognize that both recensions alike have made unsuccessful attempts to discover its true position. Consequently, when we find the Samaritans adopting a particular editorial method, we cannot dismiss it offhand as something peculiar to them, and rule out the possibility of its having prevailed among the Jews. We must carefully examine the reasons for their conduct and the marks that distinguish their production, and we must then see whether the Massoretic text shows any passages, distinguished by like marks, where similar reasons may have been in operation. If this should prove to be the case, we must consider whether they are not the products of earlier applications of the same editorial methods.

Now the Samaritan Pentateuch is remarkable for (*inter alia*) the presence of a number of larger rewritings or supplements, and a study of some of these throws an interesting light on our problem. In Num. xxi. 13 we find a very significant change. Here are the two texts side by side:—

M. T.

Thence they journeyed (משם
נסעו) and pitched, etc.

Sam.

And they journeyed from the
brook Zered (זרד) and pitched, etc.

The importance of this is twofold. Slight as the difference looks, it is one of *type*. The Massoretic reading gives the statement in a form unlike that of the itinerary of Num. xxxiii., and is attributed by the documentary theorists to one of their early narratives (E). The Samaritan, on the other hand, has the familiar stereotyped

formula of the itinerary; and, had the documentary theorists worked on this text without knowledge of any of our other copies, they must in consistency have attributed the verse to their late "source" (P). It will be recalled that we met with similar instances in Genesis, where Greek texts presented us with "JE" originals of "P" verses.¹

And this leads to the second point. Just as, in those verses of Genesis, we were able to see that the phenomena which had attracted the attention of the critical theorists were due to editorial causes, and not to a combination of preëxisting documents; so here we are enabled, by the context, to see exactly what has happened. The Samaritans maintained the original text of verse 12, "Thence they journeyed and camped at the brook Zered," because, in spite of its being preceded by a short insertion from Deuteronomy, there was no sufficient reason to alter it. But at this point they added a further extract from Deut. ii. 17-19, which was so long as to make the initial "thence" of verse 13 cumbrous and unintelligible. Therefore they resorted to the change. Thus we see that, *at a point where a dislocation of the narrative rendered the original phraseology unsuitable, a Samaritan editor smoothed the text by an alteration which took the form of the unnecessarily long-winded formula ascribed by the documentary theorists to P.* That, then, is the origin of the supposititious P in one passage. Can this be the case in others too?

The formula is found again in Ex. xiii. 20; xvii. 1; xix. 2; Num. xxi. 10, 11a; xxii. 1, as well as in the itinerary. And here a word of caution is necessary. It is by no means impossible that an old writer should occasionally have written "and they journeyed from A and encamped in B," instead of "thence they journeyed to B," or "they journeyed from A to B," or some similar phrase (see Ex. xii. 37; Num. x. 33; xi. 35; xii. 16; xx. 22a). But (a) it is most unlikely that he should have done so *continuously* in a long passage like the itinerary; and (b) it is probable

¹ See BS, April, 1918, p. 246.

that an editor who had to trim the ragged edges of the narrative would have preferred this formula, which in its long-windedness and stressing of the obvious fact of camping harmonized so well with the ideals of an epoch that sought to enlarge Torah. When we examine the other occurrences we see at a glance that several of them are at points where there are obvious breaks in the narrative. It is well known that the text of these chapters of Numbers is not in order.¹ Dr. G. B. Gray, in commenting on *xxi. 10-xxii. 1*, begins with the sentence "The passage contains the work of many writers," and points out numerous inconsistencies in its present form. With *xxi. 9* the story of the brazen serpent ends, and there is nothing to show what ought to follow it. When, therefore, we read: "And they [so Vulgate: M. T., "the children of Israel"] journeyed, and pitched in Oboth. And they journeyed from Oboth, and pitched at Iye-abarim," the easiest explanation is to regard the phraseology as the work of an editor, who, owing to the fragmentary and dislocated state of the narrative, found himself confronted with some such text as this: "when he looked unto the serpent of brass, he lived. Thence to Oboth, . . . and thence to Iye-abarim." In these circumstances he made what changes were necessary to render the story intelligible without introducing any additional information. It will be observed that he has not attempted to give the name of the station from which they went to Oboth. He has confined himself to making the text readable, and it is not clear that an uncritical age could have done anything better.

In *xxii. 1* the facts are similar. Again we have a damaged narrative. Whether we retain or remove the late insertion from Deuteronomy, which now immediately precedes this verse, we find an unmistakable gap. Here, then, the statement "and the children of Israel journeyed and pitched," etc. (again, be it noted, without a *terminus a quo*), probably represents an editorial version of an earlier fragment.

¹ See EPC, pp. 114-138; BS, Oct. 1918, pp. 575-580.

In Exodus we find xix. 2 following the misplaced chapter xviii.; so that, without entering for the present on the critical questions connected with xix. 1, we can see that it may probably be a rewriting of an earlier formula. In xvii. 1 the facts are similar. The matter that at present precedes is not the original context of the statement that the Israelites journeyed to Rephidim.

That leaves only xiii. 20; and it is impossible to say whether verses 19 and 20 were originally consecutive, or whether there has been some lesion to the text.

So far, then, our investigation shows us that, in some of the minor passages in which it occurs, the formula is probably due to editorial work similar to the Samaritan change in Num. xxi. 13, and that it may be so in all. As already indicated, it cannot plausibly be held to be early in Num. xxxiii.

Before proceeding to the consideration of the second Samaritan alteration which illuminates the probable antecedents of that passage, a word must be said about the death of Aaron. According to the most original texts known to us of Deut. x. 6 f., the Israelites were at Moserah when Aaron died. This conclusion can be avoided only by postulating a lacuna in the middle of the verse, thus:—"and the children of Israel journeyed from Beeroth-Bene-jakan to Moserah . . . there Aaron died." There is nothing to show this to be probable, and we must therefore accept Moserah as the scene of the encampment in this account. According to most texts of Num. xx. f., the Israelites were in Mount Hor at the time. There are, however, Greek variants, supported by some other evidence, which make it appear that this is not original. There is, in fact, a formal contradiction between the statements of xx. 22, 23, xxi. 4a that the Israelites were on Mount Hor, and the command of verse 25, with its fulfillment in verse 27, to bring up to the mount. How could men who were already there be brought up to the mount?

In verse 23 we find the following readings:—

- (i) "In Hor, the mount, by the border of the land of Edom" (M.T. and most authorities).
- (ii) "In Hor" (m).
- (iii) "In the mount by the border of the land of Edom" (a₂ HP 71, 84).
- (iv) "In Hor, the mount, by the border of the land of Moab" (Sahidic).

Only one theory exhausts this evidence. The Hebrew word for "mount" is used equally for mountain country. The earliest reading to which the variants witness is "in the mountain country by the border of (the land of) Moab." A glossator then erroneously wrote in the word "Hor," locating the Israelites on the mountain itself, instead of in the mountain country at its foot. That may have given us the text of m. The other texts have arisen through conflation of the two readings, combined (except in the case of the Sahidic) with an erroneous correction of "Edom" into "Moab," based on the present context of the passage.¹ Now we have already seen, in the longer discussions to which reference has been made,² that these passages are out of order. Verse 22a should not immediately precede the narrative of Aaron's death, nor should xxi. 1-3 follow it. I believe, therefore, that xx. 22b and xxi. 4a are erroneous editorial additions, patching up the fragmentary narrative in its present order; and that the Greek variants point to an earlier form, in which the children of Israel were at a place in the mountain country in the border of Moab at the foot of Mount Hor. There is no reason whatever to doubt that the name of the place was Moserah, as Deuteronomy states.

¹ See BS, Oct. 1918, pp. 578, 579.

² EPC, pp. 114-138; BS, Oct. 1918.

And so we come to the Samaritan text of Deut. x. 6 f. I set it out with the parallel passages of the M. T.

Deut. x. 6-7 (M. T.)

And the children of Israel journeyed from Beeroth Bene-jaakan to Moserah: there Aaron died, and there he was buried; and Eleazar his son ministered in the priest's office in his stead. From thence they journeyed unto Gudgodah; and from Gudgodah to Jotbathah, a land of brooks of water.

Deut. x. 6-7 (Sam.)

And the children of Israel journeyed (יָצְאוּ) from Mosereth, and pitched in Bene-jaakan. Thence they journeyed and pitched in Haggudgodah; thence they journeyed and pitched in Jotbathah, a land of brooks of water. Thence they journeyed and pitched in Abronah; thence they journeyed and pitched in Eziongeber: thence they journeyed and pitched in the wilderness of Zin (the same is Kadesh). Thence they journeyed and pitched in Hor the mountain, and Aaron died there and was buried there and Eleazar his son ministered in the priest's office in his stead.

Num. xxxiii. 31-38

And they journeyed from Mosereth, and pitched in Bene-jaakan. And they journeyed from Bene-jaakan, and pitched in Hor-Haggidgad. And they journeyed from Hor-haggidgad and pitched in Jotbathah. And they journeyed from Jotbathah, and pitched in Abronah. And they journeyed from Abronah, and pitched in Eziongeber. And they journeyed from Eziongeber, and pitched in the wilderness of Zin (the same is Kadesh). And they journeyed from Kadesh, and pitched in Mount Hor, in the edge of the land of Edom. And Aaron the priest went up into Mount Hor at the commandment of the Lord,

and died there, in the fortieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fifth month, on the first day of the month.

In Num. xxxiii. 32 f., the Samaritan reads Hor Haggudgodah.

What has happened and why? The glaring contradiction between the Deuteronomy passage and the present texts of Num. xx. and xxxiii. attracted attention, and the Samaritan editors apparently judged that there must be a mistake and set themselves to remove it. They coined the form Haggudgodah (if we vocalize it thus), out of Gudgodah and Haggidgad, for adoption in both passages. For the other names they adopted the Numbers forms.

They then rewrote the shorter Deut. x. 6-7 on the basis of the longer Num. xxxiii., which they thought correct in fact, but preserved the formula of the Deuteronomy original ("thence they journeyed," etc.), to which the context made no difficulties. Special notice should be taken of the way in which they have incorporated the little additional touches of Deuteronomy.

It is submitted that the present form of the itinerary in Num. xxxiii. is due to the methods we have seen at work in these passages of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and that the necessity for their application arose from the custodians of the text being confronted with some fragments of the original in doubtful order and in a form which made such editorial effort necessary if the passage was to read at all. It is further suggested that Deut. x. 6-7 is probably a misplaced fragment of the original itinerary, and that other fragments are preserved in what is now Num. xxi. On the other hand, it is likely that some fragments relating to Beeroth-benejaakan, Moserah, Gudgodah, and Jotbathah which originally preceded and followed the account of Aaron's death in Num. xx. were erroneously thought to belong to the itinerary, and consequently incorporated in it. To make this theory clear we must look carefully at the phenomena of the itinerary and Num. xxi.

A. The itinerary of Num. xxxiii. cannot be in an early original form for the following reasons:—

1. It does not correspond with the true original order of the narrative.¹

2. In the matter of Aaron's death it is, as we have seen, in glaring contradiction with Deut. x. 6-7, as also (in the location of Hor on the frontier of Edom) with the earliest text of Num. xx. 23.

3. The forty stations are clearly an artificial number, Ezion-geber and Kadesh (ver. 36), which are given as con-

¹ For this, reference must be made to EPC, pp. 114-138; BS, July, 1916, pp. 463 f., Oct. 1918, pp. 575-580.

secutive, are in reality seventy miles apart, and the route, so far as it can be traced, is absurd.¹

4. The intolerably tedious and repetitious form smacks of the editorial age.

B. Chapter xxxiii. mentions seventeen stations that are not otherwise known, and also contains three statements (ver. 2, 4a, 38b) not based on anything extant elsewhere. Now two of these are in the itinerary, and give little touches exactly parallel to those found in Deut. x. 6-7 and incorporated by the Samaritans in their rewriting of that passage. Further, it mentions (ver. 30-34) Moseroth, Bene-jaakan, Hor-haggidgad, and Jotbathah. It will be observed that these are fundamentally identical with the Beeroth Bene-jaakan, Moserah, Gudgodah, and Jotbathah, of Deuteronomy, but that the order of reaching Moserah differs. This and the slight variations in the names forbid the assumption that our chapter is based on the Deuteronomy passage, which is obviously a fragment of an itinerary: but we have seen that the original beginning and end of the narrative of Aaron's death in Num. xx. are missing. That was a tattered passage, and the conjecture lies near at hand that three fragments belonging to it originally ran in something like the following form:—

(a) Thence they journeyed to Bene-jaakan.

(b) Thence they journeyed to Moser (the last letter not being written).

(c) Thence they journeyed to Hor-Haggidgad, and thence to Jotbathah.

These were not recognized as belonging to the larger fragment, which tells of the death of Aaron, and were incorporated in the itinerary, (a) and (b) being accidentally placed in the wrong order.

C. At this point we must turn for a moment to Num. xxi. We have already seen that verses 33-35 are not original. The campaign against Sihon (ver. 21-25) is part of the original narrative. At the end of verse 24 we should read, with the LXX, "for Jaazer יַעֲזֵר. not with M. T. עַי.

¹ See Gray, Numbers, pp. 442 f.

“strong,” which is obviously the remains of a damaged word] is the border of the children of Ammon.”¹ The mention of Jaazer in verse 24 connects naturally with verse 32. The intervening verses (26-31) are a commentator’s addition, and verse 31 resumes verse 25 after the addition, just as in Ex. vi. verses 28-30 again take up the thread of the narrative where it had been interrupted in verse 13 by the insertion of the commentary which now intervenes.

These passages are all fragments; for, as we see from Deuteronomy, there are other narratives which are missing, and possibly the clauses “for Arnon is the border of Moab” (ver. 15), “for Jaazer is the border of the children of Ammon,” glance at lost Numbers equivalents of Deut. ii. 9, 19, the narrative in each case explaining that the Israelites kept outside the territory covered by these prohibitions.

What preceded the relation of the war against Sihon? Here geography helps us. Of Num. xxi. 20, Dr. (now Sir) G. A. Smith writes:—

“One thing is certain; this journey, though it is described in the Book of Numbers before the war with Sihon, must have come after the latter. No host, so large and cumbered as this, could have ventured down any of the glens from the Plateau to the Jordan before their own warriors had occupied Heshbon, for Heshbon, standing above them, commands these glens.”²

¹ It is conceivable that ver. 25 should run “and Israel took his cities,” not “all these cities” (M. T.). As we have seen (BS, July, 1914, pp. 471 f.), “all” is a very common gloss, and is omitted in this passage by K 128 and n; while, for “these,” o and the Vulgate read “his.” That would remove the difficulty created by the fact that the Massoretic “all these cities” refers to nothing in the present text; but it is not easy to see how “these” came into the text if that is correct. It seems more likely that “these cities” is the original text, and that the reference is to something that has been lost, “his cities” being an attempt to smooth over the difficulty.

² Historical Geography of the Holy Land (7th thousand), pp. 564 f.

In Judges xi. 18 f. we read “. . . for Arnon is the border of Moab. 19 And Israel sent messengers.” This agrees with the geographical position. It may therefore be conjectured that this is the right order; and that verses 16-20 did not originally stand in their present position, but belong to the itinerary. It fits in well with this that Num. xxxiii. makes no mention of any of the places to which these verses refer. Verses 14 f. are clearly due to an annotator, who was reminded of some verses about the Arnon by what he read here.¹

D. Returning to Num. xxxiii., we note the statement of Mosaic authorship in verse 2. After what we have seen of the way in which the editors preserved incidental touches and avoided adding matter of their own, the candid inquirer can only admit that there is no ground whatever for doubting that they found this statement in their original materials.

Thus we can now envisage the problems which confronted them. The original books had contained (*inter alia*) the Exodus-Numbers main narrative and also an itinerary. Both had become tattered and disarranged. Of the itinerary, one little piece had lodged between two “books” of Deuteronomy, just as a little piece of the Numbers narrative had strayed in at another point of junction (iv. 41 ff.). Of the remainder, some were wrongly incorporated in Num. xx.; and that left over some obvious fragments of itinerary, including the notices of verses 2 and 4a, and some shreds of narrative in forms like “thence they journeyed to *x*,” which, whether rightly or wrongly, were conceived to have belonged to the itinerary. The least that any editor could do in those days was to connect them in readable form, rewriting in his own language where necessary. (That task had of course to be accomplished without any geographical knowledge of the desert stations.) Whether the first editors did more than this we cannot say. There are some readings in Greek cur-

¹ See Critical Note, “The Text of Numbers xxi. 14f.,” BS, April, 1919, pp. 232-234.

sives which suggest that in the Hebrew text known to the LXX the present formula may not have occurred throughout. Thus, for verse 21, d has "then to Desa (Rissah); p* and s, "and they camped in Desa" (s, "Dessa"); in verse 40, d and p show similar variations (see also d's reading in Deut. x. 6)¹; and in several verses d has a shorter formula (see ver. 25, 26, 28, 30), indicating that its original before correction presented "from A to B" in more than one instance.² Consequently the uniformity of phrase is not necessarily due to the first editors. It may have resulted from subsequent correction. Further, the number of journeys was brought up to make the obviously artificial number of forty intermediate stages, and the chapter was probably conformed to the main Numbers narrative (ver. 37).³ We cannot tell whether these changes were due to the first editors or to their successors. Glossing, and probably deterioration in some of the names, completed the tale.

Such a view as this appears to explain all the facts in the light of the other phenomena of the Pentateuch and the known methods of the editorial ages.

In reference to the Exodus controversy it may now be said that, on further examination, I find myself in agree-

¹On the other hand, *eira* (then) may be a scribal note adopted where, for some reason, it was not desired to repeat the formula, or perhaps as a reference to a longer correction in the margin = "then x," i.e. "take in the journey to x at this point" (cp. A. C. Clark, *The Descent of Manuscripts* [1918], pp. 34 f.).

²The significance of this will be appreciated when we recall the fact that there is clear evidence that the archetype of dpt was a MS. of one type which had been corrected to present readings of another. Its descendants sometimes fail to give the corrections, or give them in different places. See the readings in Deut. x. 6 f.

³In this matter too we can parallel the action of the editors from the Samaritan Pentateuch. We have seen the lesson that may be learnt from the change in Deut. x. 6 f.; and there are other instances (see e.g. Ex. xviii. 25, where the Samaritan substitutes a passage founded on Deut. i.). In these cases the editorial principle seems to have been to give the preference to the longer and more detailed account.

ment with the view of those who hold the words "king of Arad" in Num. xxi. 1 to be an erroneous gloss. The original phrase appears to have been "the Canaanite who dwelt in the Negeb heard." The glossator identified this Hormah with the Hormah (Zephath) of Judges i. 16 f.¹ But, apart from the other considerations (on which see the commentaries), Zephath appears to lie too far north to fit the Pentateuchal passages.

VII

Since my work on the Pentateuch commenced, the publication of the larger Cambridge Septuagint has been begun. The contributions it has made to our knowledge, and my increased experience of the textual history, make it possible to revise and supplement, and often to corroborate, my earlier work in remarkable fashion. This is particularly the case with the numbers of the Israelites, and I am happy to be able to revert to the discussion of the subject on pages 155-169 of EPC. It is now possible to see the causes at work much more clearly than before.

A. On page 166 of EPC, I noted that "A study of the variants to the census figures collected by Kennicott reveals the fact that a large number of readings depend upon the undue omission or insertion of the Hebrew word for thousand," and I gave illustrations. There is striking corroboration from Greek MSS. The most extraordinary of these is furnished by HP 71. Holmes notes that it is written *a scriba imperito, qui voces et commata sic omittit, ut saepe numero sensum ipsum confundat*. He seems to have had before him a MS. which had been corrected, and, owing to his fortunate lack of skill, he often copies the corrections in the wrong places, thereby showing that they *were* corrections. This enables us to argue back to the earlier text.

¹ If this is correct, it should be noted that, as the phrase occurs in the Samaritan, that recension must have been made or revised after the Hebrew text had been glossed from Judges. I imagine that a detailed study of the texts would also show that the Samaritan is taken from a Hebrew Pentateuch written in the square character; but I have never examined this point closely.

In Num. i. 21-43 he regularly misplaces the word for thousands. Thus in verse 21 we get *χιλιαδες πεντακοσιαι τεσσαρακοντα εξ*, which can only mean 546,000. The most notable instance is the case of Judah (LXX 25=M. T. 27), where we actually find *τεσσαρες και χιλιαδες εβδομηκοντα εξακοσιαι*, which means 670,004. In xxvi. 7, 18 (LXX=M. T. 22) and 31 (LXX=M. T. 47), we get similar phenomena; and in xvi. 49 this MS. presents *επτακοσιαι δεκατεσσαρες χιλιαδ.* [*sic*]=714,000. The explanation obviously is that one of the ancestors of 71 lacked the thousands altogether. A corrector inserted the words marginally, and they were frequently taken into the wrong place. Thus, according to the original reading of the ancestor, the numbers of the Israelites at the first census were:—

Reuben	546	Manasseh	232
Simeon	359	Benjamin	435
Judah	674	Gad	650
Issachar	454	Dan	762
Zebulun	457	Asher	541
Ephraim	540	Naphtali	453

(presumably making a total of 6,093), and the tens and units have been multiplied by a thousand as the result of this process. There are numerous other traces in the Greek MSS. of what has happened. In xxvi. 51, M has the marginal note *εν αλλοις χιλιαδες χαψλ'*, "in other copies thousands 600, 1, 700, 30." In i. 37 (LXX=M.T. 25), *f* omits "thousands"; in i. 31 (LXX=M.T. 33), where K 84, 189, omit "thousands," *d* misplaces the word; in iii. 50 *b* has 65,000 and 300, *ir* have 5 and 60 and 300 thousands, *w* has 5 and 60 and thousands and 300, *f* has 65,300 [*πεντε και εξηκοντα (+και ir w) χιλιους (+και bw) τρια κοσιους bw fir*]; in xxvi. 27, N omits "thousands." In the last-named chapter, *m* repeatedly has thousands followed by a number representing all the digits of the Hebrew (e.g. *χιλιαδες φλβ'*) xxvi. 41 (LXX=M. T. 37), which can only mean 532,000. Taken in conjunction with the Hebrew variants given in EPC, these facts prove that the

insertion of the thousands is later than the Greek translation.

B. Great importance attaches to the readings of *m* in Num. ii. It omits verses 13, 15, 19, 21, 23, 26, 30. Through homœography it passes from Ἀσηρ in verse 27 to φυλης in verse 29; so that we cannot tell whether its original omitted verse 28, but we may presume that this was so. In verses 4, 6, 8, 11, it has only δυναμὶς αὐτοῦ without any number. In verse 8 it is supported by the Old Latin.¹ The meaning of these facts is that these verses were originally lacking in the Greek. In four places the initial phrase of these verses was copied into the margin of one of *m*'s ancestors, and thence got into the text. These facts throw some light on the history of the chapter.

C. In Num. xxv. 9, HP 71 reads 40 and 20 thousands. "Thousands" is misplaced in *d* and *m*. I venture to conjecture that originally this passage had either 40, or more probably 20, as the total number, as was so frequently the case in the early text of Judges. A variant, the introduction of "thousands," and the necessary reduction of 40 to 4 (so easy in the old system of writing) gave our present 24,000. Similarly, in xvi. 49 (Heb. xviii. 14), for 14,000, *N* has 4,000; HP 71 reads seven hundred, ten, four thousands; and *d* has thousands ten, four and seven hundred. Here I would suggest that our text has arisen from two old readings 40 and 70.² The addition of 10 and the other usual enlargements have given the present number.

D. On page 165 of EPC, importance was attached to the evidence that the "and fifty" in the number given to Gad in the first census was late. The phrase is omitted in i. 25 (LXX 37) by *K* 6, 107, 150, *gn* and the Georgian. It may now be added that the word "and" is lacking in *dp* and *m*, showing that the 50 was inserted as a correction in ancestors of those MSS. *K* 200 omits the number

¹ *K* 69 omits ver. 8, and *K* 199 omits ver. 28; but these omissions lack the systematic character of *m*'s readings, and may be accidental (see A. C. Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-6).

² Cp. Num. xxxiii. 9, where, for 70 (palms), *m* has 40 and *nb* no number; and, on the whole subject, see BS, Oct. 1917, pp. 589 ff.

(6) of the hundreds, K 109 adds "and five," and K 6 has the ו of שש ("and six") over an erasure. From these facts it was concluded that six and five were alternative readings for the number of hundreds, and that five was inserted in the margin of a copy that read six, and then taken into the text as 50. There are further traces of the process. In i. 46, bw dp omit the "and" before 50, showing these words to be a late addition to the total; in ii. 15, N dpt fir e* again omit "and"; while Boh¹ joins K 110, 181, in omitting the whole phrase; in ii. 16, Boh¹ Eth f omit the whole phrase, and dp fi m and e* again lack "and"; and in ii. 32 the whole expression is wanting in K 84 and Boh¹; while B F* N a, m dp f lack "and."

There are other instances where Greek and Hebrew authorities agree. The variations presented by the larger Cambridge LXX are very numerous. It is impossible to rely on the numbers; and, in view of the hopelessness of any attempt to restore the original, it seems to me useless to tarry over the variations. So far as we are warranted in making a guess, we may conjecture that the original reading in Ex. xii. 37; Num. xi. 21 was 6,000.

E. In Num. xxxi. the facts are similar to those in other passages we have considered. For instance, in verse 32 an Old Latin copy has 675 instead of 675,000 as the number of the oxen, and finds much support in the readings of other Septuagintal authorities. It would be as tedious as it is unnecessary to set out all the variations in this chapter. Suffice it to say, that the evidence of the insertion of "thousands" is overwhelming; while in verse 28, for "one soul in 500," Latr a^b r have "one soul in 50."

Earlier the text speaks of thousands of Israelites. I think that here the expression שָׁלֹשׁ does not denote "thousand" in the numerical sense, but means a company or unit which was technically so-called. The same sense appears in the phrase "captains of thousands." Similarly in Josh. viii. (where the Septuagintal text as a whole is immensely superior to the M. T.) I should read "three chil-

iads (companies) of men," with pt,¹ and understand the 3 companies of vii. 4 f., who were repulsed with the loss of 36 killed, as three small units in no way approaching a numerical thousand each.

VIII

The Samaritan Pentateuch often shows us the last stages of processes that have affected all our Bibles. It is apt to carry the principles which are responsible for so many of the phenomena of our Jewish texts just one step further. Readers of this Review are familiar with the conception that there have been editorial alterations in obedience to supposed Divine commands found now in one verse, now in another. The Samaritans treated Deut. xi. 24 as such a command, and in obedience to it they made two alterations. By comparing these with the Hebrew originals we are able to see clearly how the principle operated. The first passage is Gen. x. 19.

M. T.

And the border of the Caanite was from Zidon, as thou goest towards Gerar, unto Gaza; as thou goest towards Sodom and Gomorrah and Admah and Zeboiim, unto Lasha.

Sam.

And the border of the Caanite was from the River of Egypt unto the great River, the River of Euphrates, and unto the hinder sea.

It is worth lingering a minute over this. We note that, while the original cannot have been later than the time of Abraham in its first composition, seeing that it treats Sodom, etc., as still existing, the Samaritan alteration brings a new version into existence well over one thousand years later. The scholarly ideals implied are at the opposite pole from those of the modern West. We are all animated by the historical spirit; the alteration is not merely unhistorical, it is anti-historical. We regard it as our first duty to preserve as far as possible the *ipsissima verba* of an old author: these old editors were ruthless in de-

¹Verse 3. The pre-Hexaplar LXX lacked the 5,000 men of the Massoretic verse 12.

stroying them, caring only to obey what they conceived to be the word of God. We strive to exercise the minutest care in collecting and weighing the evidence and interpreting it in the most scientific spirit: they gave no thought to the evidence, knew nothing of any scientific method, and were indifferent to all considerations except their own erroneous interpretation of the Law. We may well ask what the documentary critics would have made of this passage, had they worked on the Samaritan with no knowledge of any other text. What would have been their inferences as to source, date, historical character, and textual history? Does not this verse show that the whole of their method is misconceived?

The second alteration is found in Deut. xxxiv. 1 ff. :—

M. T.

And the Lord showed him all the land of Gilead, unto Dan; and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah, unto the hinder sea; and the South, and the Plain of the valley of Jericho the city of palm trees, unto Zoar.

Sam.

And the Lord showed him all the land from the river of Egypt unto the great River, the River Euphrates, and unto the hinder sea.

Once more we see the total disregard for historical truth or physical probability. Surely we can desire no finer illustrations of the method.

It is one of the objects of the present writer's work to reverse this process wherever he finds it possible. In his experience the truth does not come all at once, and it is only gradually that he detects the mutilations and is enabled to suggest the remedies. A number of changes seem to have been due to the use of the word "baalim" for the burgesses or elders of the city who sat at the gate and administered judgment. The indications of the change are slight but sufficient, and they are assisted by the fact that different methods were employed in altering certain verses of Deuteronomy and Exodus. In the first-named book the editors operated by excisions. This was impossible in the

other case, and hence we have nonsensical substitutions.

To the gate the master brought his purchased Hebrew slave who, after six years, desired to extend his service under the provisions of Ex. xxi. 2-6; Deut. xv. 12-18.¹

“What happens? The slave publicly, in the presence of the very judges who would have to try the question of fact should any dispute hereafter arise, submits to having an indelible mark, which will always be evidence in case of any dispute, made on that part of his body where it will do least harm. If he should hereafter say, ‘True, I have this mark, but it was made without my consent,’ the knowledge of the judges will decide the issue. If all the judges be dead, yet, as the ceremony was public, there will be the maximum probability that some witness of it will survive who can prove what he saw. The ceremony may of course also have some archæological or symbolical meaning, but it is impossible to feel any doubt as to its legal and practical aspects. It is in accordance with all we know of the ceremonies of ancient law before the introduction of the properly authenticated writing, which, in a more mature system, provides the necessary evidence. In all ancient systems of law we find the same need for evidence giving rise to the same publicity, for the question of proof has to be faced in every age. The Pentateuch knows nothing of written documents properly witnessed and authenticated by the signatures or seals of all the parties to the transaction. Writing it knows—we meet with it in the Deuteronomic law of divorce and in some of the covenant ceremonies. But in those very covenant ceremonies it is a mere adjunct to the ceremonies that we see in covenants which have no writing, and in no case is the writing authenticated as it would be in any mature system of law. The Israel of the Pentateuch has yet to pass through long ages of development before its law can embody the ideas which give rise to the Egyptian legal documents of the year 2500 B.C., the Babylonian legal tab-

¹ Sir J. G. Frazer does not appear to me to hit the nail on the head in his long and rambling discussion of this ceremony (*Folklore in the Old Testament* [1918], vol. iii. pp. 165-269).

lets, the conveyance of the thirty-second chapter of Jeremiah, or the modern English deed" (SBL, pp. 26 f.).

Unfortunately the original laws spoke of the judges as the baalim, or possibly the baalim of the place or of the city. Hence, in Ex. xxi. 6, האֱלֹהִים *ha-elohim*, the gods, was substituted. Jerome still knew that the word had a plural meaning, for he renders *diis*. In Deuteronomy, on the other hand, the whole phrase, "and thou shalt bring him to the baalim," was simply cut out, and verse 17 begins "and thou shalt take," etc., without any indication of the *locus in quo*. These changes are responsible for the absurd plight of the documentary theorists who render "God" in Ex. xxi. 6.

"The critics, having obtained the curious phrase 'go to God' — a phrase better suited to idolaters than to the God of the Decalogue or a law-giver who worshipped Him — promptly substitute 'the sanctuary' for 'God.' But the change is fatal. It is true that we meet with a number of erections which the critics term 'sanctuaries,' but what were these sanctuaries? Not buildings, but altars — that is, structures, which, whatever their merits as places of worship, would not possess the one essential for this ceremony, a door or door-post. And what a curious transaction it is! A 'sanctuary' we have, but no priest, no congregation, no sacrifice, no ceremony, religious or other, merely this pinning of the slave's ear to the imaginary door or door-post. Is there any parallel to this in the legislation of the Pentateuch? And could this extraordinary proceeding serve any useful purpose?" (SBL, p. 26).¹

The same substitution has been made in Ex. xxii. 7, 8 (E.V., 8, 9), and Jerome has *ad deos*. In the last-mentioned verse he renders *si illi judicaverint*. The Massoretic text, too, still retains the plural verb necessitated by baalim; but the Samaritan, as in other cases where there is evidence of a damaged text, has smoothed it away.²

¹ On other equally ridiculous attempts to explain the phrase, see BS, Jan. 1908, pp. 108 f.

² See e.g. the removal of the article before Hormah in Num. xiv. 45.

On the other hand, Deuteronomy presents at least one more instance of the excision of the objectionable word. "If there be a controversy between men, and they come into judgment" (in xxv. 1), is followed by a number of plural verbs of which the subject is lacking. Of course we should read "and the baalim judge them," etc. The removal of the word has led to great trouble in verses 2 f.; but it will be seen that, with the restoration, B gives almost the original text:—

M. T.

And it shall be, if the wicked man be worthy to be beaten, that the judge shall cause him to lie down, and to be beaten before his face, according to his wickedness, by number. Forty stripes he may give him, he shall not exceed: lest, if he should exceed, and beat him above these with many stripes, then thy brother should seem vile unto thee.

B

And it shall be ("and" only m, Boh, Eth, Cyr-ed) if the wicked man be worthy to be beaten, *thou shalt cause* him to lie down before them, and *they* shall give him 40 stripes by number, *they* shall not exceed: but if *thou* exceed, etc.¹

It is of course possible that, in other passages of Deuteronomy, "elders" stand for an earlier "baalim"; but I have met with no sufficient evidence of this.²

¹Incidentally we may note how the text has grown through glossing, "according to his wickedness" being shown by B to be an interpretation and to have led to a duplication of the verb "beat."

²In Deut. xxi. 20, where M. T. has "elders," and LXX and Sam. "men," there is a curious piece of evidence to show that the complete phrases "unto the elders (men) of the city" are alternative glosses. K 109 has לַאֲנָשֵׁי הָעִיר. Clearly the phrase had been marginally inserted in its original, and the scribe began to copy אֲנָשֵׁי הָעִיר before he observed that he was to take in the additional words at this point. (Incidentally this throws further light on the antecedents and importance of K 109. Its original lacked the thousands in the census lists, and it often has valuable and important readings [see EPC, pp. 166 f.; BS, Oct. 1914, pp. 647 f.].)

In the previous verse "to the elders of his city and to the gate of his place" is clearly not original. K 181 and all the Septuagintal authorities, except B Lat, omit "and." Doubtless we should read

I now come to a vitally important matter—the light thrown by textual criticism on the legal provisions as to the places and kinds of sacrifice. It may be remembered that I dealt with this very fully in my pre-textual days in the sixth chapter of EPC. The present discussion *does not replace* that. Nor could anybody deal adequately with my views unless he gave careful study to the whole of that chapter as well as to the present observations. For the moment I will merely recall the fact that I distinguish between three kinds of offering; those made on behalf of the whole nation (statutory national), those offered by laymen at cairn altars under the provisions of Ex. xx. 24–26 (customary individual), and those instituted by the Pentateuch for individuals to bring to the House of the Lord (statutory individual), i.e. the “holy things and free-will offerings” of Deut. xii. 26.¹

As we have seen, the Samaritan Pentateuch in many matters represents the latest stage of all in the operation of ideas which influenced the Jewish custodians of the text. An extraordinarily significant instance is presented by Ex. xx. 24: “an altar of earth thou mayest make unto me, and thou mayest sacrifice on it thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings.” Then the texts diverge:—

M. T.

את צאנך ואת בקרך בכל המקום
אשר אזכר את שמי

Thy sheep and thine oxen in
all the place where I cause my
name to be remembered.

Sam.

מצאנך ומבקרך במקום אשר אזכרתיו
את שמי שמה

Of thy sheep and of thine
oxen in the place where I have
caused my name to be remem-
bered.

Then both continue, “I will come unto thee and I will bless thee.” “Of thy flock and of thy cattle” comes from the present form of Deut. xii. 21.

השערה, as in xxii. 15; xxv. 7. It may be that this is only the last stage in the history of the verse, and that originally it (and other verses) presented “to the baalim of the place to the gate”; but there is no evidence to support this idea, and, as at present advised, I see no sufficient ground for accepting it.

¹ See the table on p. 200 of EPC; Reeve's article “Sacrifice OT” in ISBE.

Thus the law of Exodus which in the Massoretic form permits any number of lay altars in Israelite territory,¹ is changed by the Samaritans into a law that permits sacrificial worship *at only one spot in the whole world*. That change presupposes two things: (1) that non-sacrificial slaughter *without the use of any altar at all* is well established; and (2) that either the legislation is given for a community so small and concentrated that all its members can worship at a single spot, and so sedentary that they can reasonably be expected never to travel, or else that *non-sacrificial joint public worship* (i.e. the institution of the synagogue) *has already been brought into existence, and suffices for the ordinary needs of the community's religious life*.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this last point. In days when all joint public worship was sacrificial, local concentration of sacrifice was unthinkable except for a community like the Israel of the desert. We are so used to the joint public service of prayer that we find it hard to realize the conditions that preceded the invention of the synagogue; but, once they are grasped, it will be seen that it was simply inconceivable that any religious legislation should have attempted to abolish local sacrifice, i.e. the only acts of worship ever attended by the

¹"In all the place," not elsewhere. Thus sacrificial worship could only be offered on Israelitish soil. Hence Naaman's request for "two mules' burden of earth" (2 Kings v. 17), which, by a legal fiction, would possess religious extraterritoriality, even when physically situate in Damascus (see especially EPC, pp. 220-226).

The Syriac reads "in every place (בכל מקום) where thou shalt cause my name to be remembered" in Ex. xx. 24. If this is correct, the Hebrew represents the first attempt to convert the passage from a law sanctioning a plurality of lay altars into an enactment of an exclusive place of sacrifice. Note the textual implications: (1) It would strikingly confirm the view (BS, Jan. 1915, pp. 92 ff., 123) that the Hebrew and Samaritan represent the text of the Jerusalem Temple. (2) It would show the relative lateness of the alterations in the Divine appellations which appear to rest on the Massoretic form of the verse (cp. BS, Jan. 1915, p. 142, with April, 1915, pp. 324 ff.). K 199 and LXX also read "in every place."

overwhelming majority of the women and children or (except at the three annual pilgrimages) by the males of all localities except the capital.

I am going to suggest that the Samaritan alteration of Ex. xx. 24-26 was preceded by a Jerusalem Temple alteration of Deut. xii., — a chapter which, in its original form, I hold to have been the basis for the conduct of the pre-Exilic religious leaders of the people in the matter of sacrifice. But I must first clear away minor points on other chapters.

In Deut. xiv. 26, for "thine household" (ביתך) B Arm Sah read "thy son" (בניך).

In xv. 20, for "thine household," HP 71 has "thy sons" (בניך).

In xvi. 11, M. T. has "and thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are in the midst of thee, in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to cause his name to dwell there"; but m and bw omit "in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to cause his name to dwell there," m also omitting the words "that are in the midst of thee."

In xvi. 15, d omits the words "seven days shalt thou keep a feast unto the Lord thy God in the place which the Lord shall choose."

There can be no doubt that in all these cases the Masoretic text is wrong, and the variants are right; for in the following verse it is expressly said: "three times in a year shall all thy *males* appear," etc. Obviously the lawgiver had not the faintest intention of including women and children in the compulsory pilgrimages. Note, too, that in verse 8 the remaining days of the feast are celebrated after the return of the pilgrims (ver. 7). So far as the women and children of the population residing outside the capital were concerned, the festivals could, in the contem-

plation of the lawgiver, normally be celebrated at home.¹ This then brings us to Deut. xii.

Two views of that chapter are current: (1) it is Mosaic as it stands, (2) it is post-Mosaic, and made non-sacrificial slaughter lawful for the first time. To these I oppose the view that (3) it is Mosaic, but has suffered in transmission. The reference to Ex. xx. 24 in Deut. xii. 21 has been mutilated. In its original form the last-named verse justified the sacrifices of Saul and Samuel and all other customary sacrifices in Palestine in cases where the central sanctuary was too distant.

The first view suffers from this dilemma: Either Deut. xii. contradicts Ex. xx. 24, and is in turn contradicted by the practices and views of an Elijah (1 Kings xviii.) and an Elisha (2 Kings v. 17 ff.), *even after the construction of Solomon's Temple*, in addition to being impracticable and inconceivable in an age when all public worship was sacrificial, or else it recognizes and quotes the earlier law, but in a barely intelligible form. After what we have learnt of the transmission of the Pentateuch, the impartial reader will probably agree that damage to the text is more likely.

On the second hypothesis the law of Deuteronomy deliberately contradicts Exodus, and was unknown till the time of Josiah. This is impossible for these reasons:—

(a) The words in Deut. xii. 21 ... חֲבַחַת מִבְּקָרָךְ וּמִצֹּאֵןךְ “and thou mayest *sacrifice* [or slaughter—the same word as in Ex. xx. 24] of *thine oxen* and of *thy sheep* . . . as I commanded thee” are a direct reference to the earlier text. The command is not to be found elsewhere. It is quite inconceivable that a legislator who wished to *repeal* an existing law should quote and *confirm* it.

(b) As I have so often pointed out, non-sacrificial slaughter is common before the time of Josiah (see e.g.

¹ Elkanah appears to have been usually accompanied by his wives as well as his sons (1 Sam. i. 4). The M. T. introduced daughters here too, but they were unknown to B. In the case of the wives the pilgrimage was optional (ver. 22).

EPC, pp. 175-178). It may be added that Hos. ix. 4, while textually doubtful, probably implies that mourners, i.e. people unclean by reason of contact with the dead, could and did eat food in the manner provided by Deut. xii. 21 f. For remember, it is a cardinal point of the Wellhausen theory that the unsacrificial eating of meat was first introduced in Josiah's time by the then recently composed Book of Deuteronomy. If the facts prove that non-sacrificial slaughter is earlier, the whole theory falls.¹ I do not know whether he supposed the Israelites in Egypt to have been vegetarians for the space of 430 years (see Gen. xliii. 16)! It is certain that they did not sacrifice (Ex. viii. 22, E. V. 26).

(c) Saul clearly knew of some laws permitting the eating of meat killed at a cairn altar, but forbidding the consumption of the blood (1 Sam. xiv. 32-35). No such prohibition occurs in any portion of the Pentateuch assigned by the documentary theorists to an earlier date than Deuteronomy, but it *does* occur in Deut. xii. 23.

(d) As already indicated, it is quite inconceivable that a religious legislator *who had in view the difficulties of distance* ("if the place be too far for thee," ver. 21) should have enacted that, with the exception of the inhabitants of the capital, no woman or child need partake in any act of joint worship; and that, in practice, all men (with the like exception) should attend such worship only three times in each year.

(e) The original text of Deut. xvi. manifestly does contemplate local rejoicings before the Lord in which women and others participated.

What the first text of Deut. xvi. 21 was we cannot say. The Samaritan travels a stage further on the road of corruption. It alters "shall choose" into "has chosen" in verses 5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26, in accordance with its usual method of representing Mount Gerizim as the sole place of lawful sacrifice enjoined by God. It also changes "to

¹ I leave out of consideration Deut. xii. 15 f., because many critics plausibly reject these verses as a glossator's addition.

set his name" (לשון שמו) in verse 21 into "to make his name dwell" (לשכן את שמו). This reading may be of importance as illustrating the tendency to revise the text in the light of Jewish mystical ideas,¹ but does not help the present inquiry.

The LXX still contains a delicate indication of the point at which the mutilation occurred. It is noticeable that for the consecutive *וְהָיָה* we here find *καὶ θύσεις*, "and thou shalt sacrifice." This is certainly not the invariable practice of the Greek translators of the Pentateuch, where the perfect consecutive occurs in an apodosis.² It seems, therefore, that the excision occurred just before this word, and that the Greek "and" was left standing.³

The most probable view of the matter is that the apodosis contained at least the words "thou mayest offer up thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings," possibly also some such phrase as "on an altar of earth or unhewn stones" immediately in front of *וְהָיָה*. These were cut out in the interests of the Jerusalem temple after the service of the synagogue had superseded local *lay* sacrifice, which had been killed by the Exile. The language of verses 13 f. would help to bring about the change in an unhistorical age, and a polemical motive directed against other sanctuaries, such as the Elephantine temple or the temple of Onias, may have provided the inspiration. In this connection it must be remembered that Isa. xix. 18 "city of righteousness," which is preserved by the LXX, has been altered into "city of desolation" through hostility to the temple of Onias. I conjecture, therefore, that the first text of the passage ran somewhat as follows:—

¹ See BS, April, 1918, pp. 261 f. Incidentally it may be noted that the Samaritans introduced *אָה*, which was not in the earlier text.

² See the renderings in Gen. xii. 12; xviii. 26; xxiv. 8, 41 (text of D bw, m, p, Arm, Eth, Boh: the others insert *καὶ*); xxxii. 9; Ex. xviii. 16; Num. xxx. 15 (text of Arm, Eth, Lat: the others insert *καὶ*).

³ *Θ's* *θύσεις* for *θύσεις* appears to be a mere copyist's error.

“If the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to set his name there be too far for thee, thou mayest offer up thy burnt-offerings and thy peace-offerings [? on an altar of earth or unhewn stones] and sacrifice [slaughter] of thine oxen and of thy sheep as I commanded thee, and eat flesh in thy gates according to all the desire of thy soul.”

If this be the true account of the matter, it will be seen that the whole body of the historical instances of lay sacrifice is as much in accordance with the original text of Deuteronomy as are the cases of non-sacrificial slaughter with the extant copies of the book.¹

¹This investigation has now reached a point at which it becomes necessary to consider the religion of Moses. It is hoped, therefore, to devote the next article to a study of his faith, and to resume this series later.