



# LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

[www.huc.edu/libraries](http://www.huc.edu/libraries)

## Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

HARMONISTIC INTERPRETATIONS

of

HEXATEUCHAL INCONGRUITIES AND CONTRADICTIONS

in

JEWISH LITERATURE

by

ABRAHAM JOSEPH MESSING.

[1846]

Microfilmed 6/16/66  
Moira Steiner

P R E F A C E .

This little book represents the fruits of almost two years' arduous and painstaking research. No one who has delved to any extent into the exegetical literature of the O. T., both critical and traditional, can fail to appreciate the amount of the labor which has been extended upon its pages. The task of reading one's self into a new literature (Cf. list of books infra. p.) of mastering methods and accumulating results, of following out intricate arguments and understanding the subtle relations between an occasional phrase and vast movements of thought is certainly no easy one.

I should not direct attention here to these facts were it not that they are likely to be overlooked or misunderstood. The theme with which I deal presupposes a thorough training in a science which has not yet become naturalized in the realms of Jewish thought. My acquaintance with that science is naturally supposed to be limited to a mere knowledge of its existence. It is not improbable therefore that many persons aware of these circumstances (both the charitably inclined who will read the book through and the uncharitable who will merely glance at the title)--will be disposed to regard the work not as the result of my own unaided efforts, but as wholly the mere collection and display of the 'pearls of others.' In order to obviate any misunderstanding of this nature which may

arise it devolves upon me to recount the circumstances under which this book came to be written.

In the beginning of my Junior year my studies quite naturally led me into the field of the higher criticism. It was during the period of earnest searching and testing which followed upon this study--the Stirb und Werde period of my life--that the thought suggested itself to make a comparative study of the principles on which the peculiar phenomena of the composite Hexateuch are explained by Criticism and Tradition. Thus this thesis originated. But I soon found that I had neither the time nor the proper equipment to work myself through what turned out to be in most cases the complicated and exceedingly difficult interpretations of the Rabbis. I sought aid of Dr. Margolis, and under his instruction the subject took a wider and more comprehensive scope. It was made to include the age of Redaction, the early translations, the work of Philo and Josephus.

To Dr. Margolis then I owe more than I can adequately express here. My whole conception, it is true, of Harmonistic Interpretation and its development in Jewish history and religion is largely the fruit of his teaching and inspiration. But the rest of this essay is my own. Plan, construction, arrangement of material, illustration, diction and verification of references I can safely claim is the product of my own thinking. I sought aid in the construction of this work not because I felt myself unable to write a suitable thesis in dif-

ferent lines without any assistance whatsoever, but because this was the only way that I could hope to meet the obligations of a true scientific exposition in this one,--and the more practical needs of those who have to form an opinion concerning the cause, course and history of a particular case of biblical interpretation. Large then as is the debt which I owe to Dr. Margolis I am sure that even he will concur with me in the sentiment that 'Though I light my candle at my neighbor's fire that does not alter the property nor make the wax or the flame or the whole candle less my own.'

The benefits which have already accrued to me from this study are such as I cannot adequately express. For me the 'shallow and stagnant pools of tradition' have turned to 'rivers of life.' Where once all seemed stupidity and darkness there is now revealed a glory of reason and light. This voyage of discovery on the strange, wild, weird sea of the Talmud 'with its leviathans and wrecks of golden argosies' cannot but influence the whole course of my future thinking. As for the medieval exegetes, the breath of a true renovation began with this inquiry to pass over the valley in which for me at least during so long a period the bones had been so dry. Rationalism I found is no noxious growth. It pulsates the current of a noble life. A study of the characteristics of our medieval sages lingers like the fragrance of a flower. And further, though once I had been tempted to explain the difficulties of the Pentateuch on the hypothesis that the book was an

immense intentional and continuous enigma, now a reconsideration of the historic setting and a clearer view into the moral purpose of God has changed these very difficulties from barriers into bulwarks of faith.

I wish to express here my sense of the insufficiency of the work as it now stands. I feel that I have not wholly succeeded in weeding out a certain tendency to cloudiness, obscurity or 'hardness' of style. It is my intention to clear the work of these obvious faults at some future time. Indistinct conjectures and imperfect inductions will be gradually replaced by clear and well defined conceptions. Moreover, there shall be supplied a full and analytical Index, not only to make reference easy, but also to enable the reader to judge what sort of fare he may expect if he is minded to make a trial of it.

The nature of this work allows to the intellect endless scope for labor and research and progress. In its present form it is far from complete. The exegesis of Philo, for instance, has been but lightly touched upon, partly because of its extreme obscurity, and partly because of my own insufficient equipment to deal adequately with so complex a problem as the Alexandrian hermeneutic presents. It seems to me that by including later on sketches of this kind, extending over a wide area and by giving connection to the whole, I might offer a work that would have practical value for uses of record and reference in addition to whatever qualities as an essay

in biblical criticism it should be found to possess. For the present all that I can say is that I have done--not perhaps the best that I might have done under more favorable conditions of leisure and opportunity--but the best that was possible to me under such circumstances as I could command.

To avoid any misconception, it may be added that no attempt has been made to plead for any theory. In collecting so many examples of contradictions and incongruities in the Pentateuch together with their traditional harmony it was as little my intention to attempt of vindication of traditionalism as it was to forge weapons for criticism. To attempt to find criticism in the Talmud (as M. Eisenstadt has done, Cf. his 'Ueber Bibelkritik in der Talmudischen Literatur' and vide criticism by Dr. G. Deutsch, 'Deborah' June 13/94) is a seeking of the living among the dead. To do this was as far removed from the spirit in which I pursued my task as was the attitude of the scholars of the last century who saw in the discrepancies of the Pentateuchal narratives only priestcraft and intentional fraud.

The Pentateuch indeed contains incongruities and contradictions, but their higher harmony appears to him who gives up his whole mind in reverence for the deep and essential truths which the Tora of Moses contains--truths indeed which have happily been placed above the reach of Exegesis to injure, being written also in the books of Nature and Experience and on the tablets which cannot be broken of the heart of Man.

-----

C O N T E N T S .

-----

PREFACE.

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS EMPLOYED.

INTRODUCTION.

I. THE BEGINNINGS OF TRADITIONALISM.

II. TRADITIONALISM DEVELOPED.

III. RATIONALISM.

CONCLUSION.

INDEX.



## THE PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS.

- Bacon, T.T.E., . . . . . Bacon, Benj. Wisner, The Triple Tradition of the Exodus. 1894.
- Bacon, Gn. . . . . Bacon, Benj. Wisner, The Genesis of Genesis, 1894.
- Benzinger, . . . . . Benzinger, J., Hebr. Archæologie, 1894.
- Bleek, . . . . . Bleek, F., Introd. to O.T. (2 ed. by A. Kamphausen, trans. by G.H.Venables, 1869.)
- Buhl, . . . . . Buhl, Frants, Canon & Text of the O.T. (trans. by John Macpherson, 1892.)
- Colenso, . . . . . Colenso, J.W. The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined. 2 vol. 1863/
- Cornill, . . . . . Cornill, C.H., Einleitung in das O.T., 1891.
- Dillm, . . . . . Dillman<sup>m</sup>, Aug., Commentary on the Hexateuch in the Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum O.T., 1886.
- Dt.
- Dr. . . . . Deuteronomy by E.R.Driver (The International Critical Comm. Series.)
- Tenses
- Dr. . . . . Driver, S.R., A treatise on the use of the tenses in Hebrew (ed. 3, Oxf. 1892.)
- Farrar, . . . . . Farrar, F.W., History of Interpretation (Bampton Lectures, 1886.)
- Frankel, Einfluss. . . . . Frankel, Z., Ueber den Einfluss der paläst- inischen Exegese auf die Alexandrinische Hermeneutik, 1851 .
- Frankel, Vors. . . . . Frankel, Z. Vorstudien zu d. Septuaginta. 1841.
- Geiger, Urs. . . . . Geiger, Abraham. Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel. 1857.
- Hengst . . . . . Hengstenberg, E.W. The Authenticity of the Pent. Trans. by J.E.Ryland.
- Holzinger. . . . . Holzinger, H., Einleitung in den Hexat. 1893
- Kalisch. . . . . Kalisch, M.M. Histor and Crit. Comm. to Gn. and Ex., 1858.

- Kuen. . . . . Keenan, A., The Hexateuch (Eng. trans. of the corresponding part of the author's Hist-crit. inquiry into the origin of the books of the O.T.) 1886.
- L.O.T. . . . . An Introduction to the Literature of the O.T. by S.R.Driver (ed. 5, 1894).
- Mielz. . . . . Mielziner, M. Introduction to the Talmud. 1894.
- O.T.J.C. . . . . The Old Testament in the Jewish Church by W. Robertson Smith ed. 2, 1892.
- Reuss, Gesch. . . . . Ruess, Eduard, Geschichte d. Heiligen Schriften alten Testaments. 1890.
- Wellh. Comp. . . . . Wellhausen, J. Die Composition des Hexat., 1889.
- Wellh. Prol. . . . . Wellhausen, J., Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels. 1883.

MT. -- Massoretic text.      LXX. -- the Greek Version of the O.T.  
 Siphra (ed. Weiss Vienna 1862)      Mekilata (ed. Weiss Vienna 1885)  
 Siphre (ed. Friedmann Vienna 1864).

I. I N T R O D U C T I O N .

THE CURRENT CRITICAL HYPOTHESIS. HISTORY OF CRITICAL OPINION.  
THE TASK OF THE REDACTOR. EDITORIAL HARMONIES. THE DIASKEUASTS  
OR REDACTORIAL AGE. HARMONISTIC ALTERATIONS FROM THE DIASKEUAST.  
THE FIXING OF THE TEXT. HARMONIES TRANSFERRED TO THE FIELD OF  
EXEGETIC. THE THESIS STATED.

I. ACCORDING TO THE CURRENT CRITICAL HYPOTHESIS THE PENTATEUCH AS AN ORGANIC WHOLE IS NOT THE PRODUCT OF ONE MIND OR OF ONE AGE, BUT IS MADE UP OF DIFFERENT STRATA CORRESPONDING TO DIFFERENT STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ISRAEL'S INSTITUTIONS. IT EMBRACES MOSAIC ORIGINALS, SEVERAL DIFFERENT CODES AND HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS AND THE HAND-  
 IWORK OF A NUMBER OF EDITORS AT DIFFERENT EPOCHS IN THE HISTORY OF THE HEBREW PEOPLE, THE PRESENT UNITY BEING THE RESULT OF A FINAL REDACTION OF ALL THE EARLIER ELEMENTS.

The view that the so-called books of Moses do not form one homogeneous narrative but are a compilation is not so very modern. As early as 1521 the integrity of the Pentateuch was questioned by Carlstadt, the Wittenberg theologian, who was convinced that its authorship was not Mosaic. Similar results were reached in the following century by Hobbes, the British philosopher, Peyrerius the Roman Catholic priest, and Spinoza, who revived the doubts of Ibn Ezra, a Jewish scholar of the 12th century. It remained however for a layman, Jean Astruc of Montpellier, son of a Huguenot priest and physician to Louis XIV. to make the step from mere remarks and vague conjectures to the initial discovery of characteristic distinctions in the complex structure of the pentateuchal narratives and thus to found the systematic source-criticism from which the modern scientific exegesis has developed. In the year 1753 while pondering the question as to how the Mosaic authenticity might be saved from the pretensions of 'bold and sceptic minds' he noted in Genesis the alternate use of two different names for God, Jehovah and Elohim. From this fact he drew the conclusion that our book of Genesis is the result of the fusion of two prior and independent Geneses. These documents of 'memoires' he supposed to have been older than Moses who was merely their final editor.

The result thus attained by Astruc was of course no more than a hint for further investigation. In 1798 K. D. Ilgen in that remarkable work rejoicing in the formidable title: 'The sources of the Jerusalem-Temple archives in their original form etc.' discovered in addition to Astruc's two great documents a third which also uses the name Elohim, but which as regards subject matter and style approaches Astruc's Jehovist much as it differentiates itself from his Elohist. Besides these three primary sources, certain recurring phenomena led Ilgen to believe that there were likewise in Genesis seventeen minor and independent documents.

Various sources having thus been discovered in the narrative it was easy by an undue extension of the correct principle to think of Genesis as a conglomeration of disconnected incoherent fragments different in origin and pieced together in a loose thread of chronological order. This 'Fragment-theory' was given classical expression by J. S. Vater in 1805, who after an examination of the entire Pentateuch said: 'The five books from first to last fall into separate pieces; in large pieces, in small pieces and in very small pieces from which it does not appear that they ever had originally any organic connection with one another.' But on this theory how could one account for the remarkable unity apparent in the construction of the Pentateuch? To throw the narratives into a chaos of atomistic fragments did not seem to give an adequate account of all the facts of the matter. DeWette in 1817 in an epoch-making work demonstrated this well-considered regularity of plan, this unity and sustained connection of the narratives, and accounted for it on the hypothesis that the first 'Elohim' document (originally discovered by Astruc) was the ground-plan, the basic frame into which all the other sources had been fitted. This view was known as the 'Supplement Theory'; and the ground-document which DeWette characterized as the 'national epos of the Hebrew theocracy' was known by his followers as the 'Grundschrift.' DeWette is significant moreover for having pointed out the peculiar style and character of Deuteronomy, proving thereby that it must be considered apart from the rest of the Pentateuch. He was the first also in this connection to closely examine and determine the value of the passage in II Kings 22 relative to the law-book found during Josiah's reign, drawing therefrom the conclusion that Deuteronomy was first edited in the days of that good king. To the followers of DeWette's school is due the credit of laying the deeper foundations in internal characteristics toward a minuter severance of the sources. Especially noteworthy too was the contribution of Bleek who in 1822 showed that the book of Joshua is the natural continuation of the history which begins in Genesis and is the compilation of the same final editor. Thus the Hexateuch,--the Pentateuch plus Joshua, not the Pentateuch alone--was to be henceforth the field of investigation.

As the science of Biblical Criticism progressed, two facts came to the surface which seemed to invalidate the whole 'Supplement Hypothesis.' (1) How was it possible on DeWette's theory for the Jahovist who merely supplemented the Elohist to insert passages wholly contradicting the basal narrative? (2) How could the Jahovist be regarded as a mere non-independent supplementer when in fact his narrative is so prominent as to appear in the partition

of the sources as a concerted and consistent whole. And so the Supplement Theory was seen not to correspond to the facts. Ewald (1851) and Hupfeld (1853) mark the reaction to the old Documentary hypothesis. The author of the Grundschrift, The Jahwist and the second Elohist are all three independent writers and so far from the last two being mere supplementers, it seems that their narratives were composed without any inter-comparison. The individual documents however, are not always homogeneous. Each may have been expanded and altered in successive redactions and contain accretions of poetry and legislation from older sources.

Speaking broadly then the critics now divide the Hexateuch into three groups of literature (1) The oldest history represented by two documents that are cited as the Jahwistic and Elohistic stories. (2) The Deuteronomistic writing with its appendages and (3) The Grundschrift or First Elohist. The last document by its marked peculiarities of language and mannerisms of style can be easily disengaged from the context into which it is interwoven from the first verse of Genesis almost to the end of Joshua. It is found to contain a systematic account of the origins of Israel treating with particular minuteness the various ceremonial institutions leading up to the elaborate priest's code in Leviticus and parts of Numbers. Hence it is usually alluded to by the later critics under the rubric P (Priestly Writer) while P1 P2 P3 etc. serve to characterize the various strata from which it has been built up. The Jahwist is symbolized by J; the second Elohist by E or where it is difficult to effect an exact partition between them they are referred to as JE. By D (D1 D2 D3 etc;) we are to recognize the Deuteronomic writings: by R RJE RJED, etc. the various redactors.

Contemporary criticism is divided on the question as to the dates of the composition and incorporation of these writings into our present Hexateuch. All agree however, that J (composed in the Southern Kingdom) and E (composed in the northern) were welded together into one not later than 750 B.C., and further that D originated in Josiah's time 621 B.C. In 1866 K. H. Graf undertook to prove that P was composed after the Exile when it was joined to JE+D making our present Hexateuch. Dillmann placed P about 800 B.C., long before Deuteronomy, and led the opposition against Graf's hypothesis. The Grafian theory however, is now the prevailing one and was first defended by Reuss and Kuenen, subsequently by Wellhausen, who wrote a comprehensive reconstruction of the History of Israel on the lines therein laid down.

II. THE FINAL BLENDING OF THE HEXATEUCHAL DOCUMENTS TOOK PLACE SOME TIME BETWEEN 444 B.C. THE YEAR OF EZRA'S PROMULGATION OF THE PRIESTLY CODE AND 280 B.C. THE YEAR OF THE APPEARANCE OF THE SEPTUAGUIT (LXX) TRANSLATION. THE EDITOR DID HIS WORK IN A CONSERVATIVE SPIRIT. ALMOST ALWAYS HE LETS THE DOCUMENTS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES. STILL NARRATIVES FROM DIFFERENT SOURCES HAD TO BE DOVETAILED INTO EACH OTHER AND LAWS FROM VARIOUS COLLECTIONS INCORPORATED INTO A SINGLE WHOLE. AND SO HE COULD NOT ALLOW THE SAME FACT TO BE REPEATED WITHOUT VARIATION, OR SUFFER DISCORDANT ACCOUNTS TO STAND SIDE BY SIDE. CONTRADICTIONS AND INCONGRUITIES STARTLING EVEN TO MEN OF HIS AGE HAD TO BE REMOVED OR SOFTENED OR THE CREDIT OF HIS COMPILATION WOULD BE IMPAIRED AND THE AUTHORITY AND PRESTIGE OF THE CODES BE SHATTERED. THE REDACTOR OF THE HEXATEUCH IS THE FIRST HARMONIST. OF COURSE, WITH HIS EASY NOTIONS ON HISTORICAL EVIDENCE THE CONTRADICTIONS WHICH HE REMOVED WERE ONLY THOSE THE MOST IMMEDIATELY PERCEPTIBLE, THOSE WHICH EVEN IN HIS JUDGMENT COULD NOT BE RECONCILED BY THE UTMOST VIOLENCE OF INTERPRETATION.

The harmonistic character of this redaction will become clear by illustrating the way in which two parallel stories coming from different sources were compiled into the text. In Gen. 28<sup>10</sup> (J) it is related that Jacob leaves the patriarchal seat at Beersheba for Paddan-Aram. Yahwe appears to him on the way from a ladder reaching to heaven (28<sup>13</sup>) and renews to him the promise of numerous descendants. Jacob thereupon names the place Bethel, although before it had been called Luz (28<sup>19</sup>). Such is the story told in Gn. 28. In Gn. 32<sup>23</sup> (which also belongs to the document J) Jacob meets with another theophany. The patriarch is on his return from Paddan-Aram. One night remaining alone a man wrestles with him until morning 32<sup>24</sup>); unable to overcome him, his opponent dislocates his (Jacob's) hip-bone. Hence the name Jacob is

changed to Israel (32<sup>28</sup>) and Jacob calls the place Peniel (32<sup>30</sup>).

The document P contained a story which appears to have *been* built up out of elements common to Gn. 28 and Gn. 32, since in substance it is the same although the details vary. According to this source (Gn. 35<sup>a</sup>) God appears to Jacob on his return from Paddan-Aram and changes his name to Israel, whereupon Jacob calls the place Bethel (35<sup>15</sup>). The contradictions between J and P are apparent. While the story in 35<sup>15</sup> + 35<sup>a</sup> makes Jacob name Bethel when coming from Paddan-Aram; 28<sup>19</sup> + 28<sup>10</sup> relates that it occurred while he was going to it from Beer-Sheba. Again while 35<sup>15</sup> asserts that Jacob was changed to Israel at Bethel, 32<sup>28</sup> + 32<sup>30</sup> declares the event to have occurred at Peniel. Furthermore in 35<sup>9-15</sup> the change of Jacob's name is effected without a struggle with an angel such as is described in 32<sup>24</sup> and without an explanation of the meaning of the change such as is given in 32<sup>28</sup>; while Bethel is named without the story of the ladder as told in 28<sup>13</sup>. The Redactor after the dove-tailing of J and P had been effected, felt the force of these contradictions. He could not suffer two such discordant accounts to stand side by side without some attempt at reconciliation. The reader would naturally ask himself: "Did Jacob name Bethel twice? Did Did Jahwe change Jacob's name twice? For the two accounts certainly seem to refer to two separate occasions." It was probably just such considerations as these that gave the Redactor the hint for harmonizing the discrepancies. Since 35<sup>9-15</sup> though treating of the same subject matter does not refer in the least to the former occasions and in the main has quite a different view of both transactions, it certainly does not presuppose the former stories. Hence it may be regarded as recording an entirely new and distinct theophany in which Jacob's name was really changed into Israel once more and in which Bethel was indeed named over again. The Redactor wished that it should be so regarded. Hence he interpolated into P 35<sup>a</sup> the word 'again' thus indicating that here is recorded a theophany unrelated in any way to those which had preceded. And by this interpolation all the conflicts arising in this section from the blending of incongruous documents are harmonized.

III. THE REDACTOR NATURALLY ENOUGH COULD SUCCEED IN IMPARTING TO HIS BLENDED DOCUMENTS ONLY A SUPERFICIAL UNITY. THE PRODIGIOUS TASK OF HARMONIZING IN DETAIL HIS DIVERGENT NARRATIVES HE WAS COMPELLED TO LEAVE TO LATER SCRIBES WHO THUS COMBINED IN THEMSELVES THE FUNCTIONS BOTH OF EDITORS AND COPYISTS. THE REDACTION OF THE



HEXATEUCH THEREFORE PROPERLY SO-CALLED MUST NOT BE REGARDED AS A WORK COMPLETED AT ONE STROKE, "SIMUL ET SEMEL," BUT AS A LABOR WHICH FOR THE TIME BEING FOUND ONLY A PROVISIONAL CONCLUSION AND WHICH WAS SUBSEQUENTLY CONTINUED AND BROUGHT TO A CLOSE ONLY AFTER A LONG PERIOD. THIS EDITORIAL PROCESS IS WHAT KUENÉN HAS TERMED A 'CONTINUOUS DIASKEUE' AND ITS NATURE IS MADE APPARENT BY THE VARIATIONS WHICH APPEAR IN A COMPARISON OF THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH AND THE SEPTUAGUIT (LXX) VERSION WITH OUR RECEIVED MASSORETIC TEXT (MT). THESE VARIATIONS CAN ONLY BE EXPLAINED AS THE RESULTS OF A PRE-MEDITATED TEXT-REVISION IN THE EARLY HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS FROM ONE OF WHICH THE LXX WAS MADE BEFORE THE PROCESS WAS COMPLETE. THE SPIRIT IN WHICH THE DIASKEUASTS WORKED IS ADMIRABLY ILLUSTRATED BY GEIGER: "THE BIBLE IS AND AT ALL TIMES WAS A WORD FULL OF FRESH LIFE, NOT A DEAD BOOK. THIS EVERLASTING WORD BELONGED NOT TO A PARTICULAR AGE; IT COULD NOT BE DEPENDENT (FOR ITS MEANING) ON THE TIME WHEN IT WAS WRITTEN DOWN, AND AS LITTLE UPON THIS THEORY COULD IT BE WITHOUT WHAT SEEMED TO BE NEW TRUTHS AND DISCOVERIES. HENCE EVERY PERIOD, EVERY SCHOOL, EVERY INDIVIDUALITY INTRODUCED INTO THE BIBLE ITS OWN WAY OF REGARDING THE CONTENTS OF THE BIBLE. IN LATER TIMES THIS TOOK PLACE IN THE FIELD OF EXEGESIS, BUT BEFORE THAT, WHEN THE BIBLE HAD NOT YET ATTAINED AN ABSOLUTELY FIXED FORM, THE SAME RESULT WAS REACHED BY MANIPULATION OF THE TEXT. THUS THE BIBLE BECAME THE FULL EXPRESSION OF THE HIGHER LIFE OF THE PEOPLE. THAT WHICH SEEMED DEFICIENT IN THE TEXT OF THE HOLY BOOK, THE NATIONAL SPIRIT INNOCENTLY SUPPLIED AND, UNCONSCIOUS OF ANY BREACH OF LAW, IMPRESSED ITS OWN STAMP ON THE TRADITIONAL TEXT."

A comparison of the LXX translation of Gn. 47<sup>1-6</sup> with the MT furnishes a remarkable illustration of harmonistic diaskeuasis. The LXX which is the more ancient of the two presents a text in which the narrative of the Priest's Code is kept together in logical sequence and without any break between verses and half-verses, whereas the Hebrew text which is of more recent date, has omitted some portions of the Code and split up others by violently wedging in between them a passage taken from the older sources. Verses 1-4 (J) are the same in both texts. In V 1-2 Joseph according to his promise (46<sup>31</sup>) announces to Pharaoh the arrival of his people in the land of Goshen and at the same time presents five of his brothers. In V 3-4 as had been foreseen (46<sup>33</sup>) Pharaoh asks them the nature of their occupation to which the brothers reply as instructed (46<sup>34</sup>) requesting likewise the royal sanction to their sojourning in the land of Goshen. So far the LXX and MT agree; now note the divergence.

MT.LXX.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><u>P 5.</u> <u>And Pharaoh spake unto Joseph saying, Thy father and thy brethren are come unto thee.</u></p> <p>6. <u>The land of Egypt is before thee; in the best of the land make thy father and thy brethren to dwell; in the</u></p> <p><u>J</u> <u>land of Goshen let them dwell; and if thou knowest any able men amongst them, then make them rulers over my cattle.</u></p> <p><u>P 7.</u> <u>And Joseph brought in Jacob his father and set him before Pharaoh...</u></p> | <p><u>J.5.</u> <u>And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, Let them dwell in the land of Goshen and if thou knowest any able men amongst them make them rulers over my cattle.</u></p> <p><u>P.6.</u> <u>And Jacob and his sons came into Egypt to Joseph; and Pharaoh, King of Egypt, heard of it, and Pharaoh spake unto Joseph, saying, Thy father and thy brethren are come unto thee; behold, the land of Egypt is before thee; in the best of the land make thy father and thy brethren to dwell.</u></p> <p><u>P.7.</u> <u>And Joseph brought in Jacob his father.....</u></p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The following considerations prove that the MT here is not the original text. Pharaoh's reply in V 5 'Thy father and thy brethren are come unto thee' not only runs counter to the context (inasmuch as it is addressed not to the brothers who had just put the request before him but to Joseph) but Pharaoh could not have spoken thus to Joseph at the time. Why not? Because Joseph knew as well as Pharaoh himself that this father and brethren were come,

since he had himself apprised Pharaoh of the fact (47<sup>1</sup>). Besides not only had Pharaoh already given them audience but Joseph himself had been present at the audience (47<sup>2</sup>) and had himself introduced them to the king. Nor does it require any knowledge of Semitic philology to perceive that v. 6B which causes a break in the narrative of P is not in its original place as it is in the older Greek text. For it is the direct answer to the request made by Joseph's brothers in v. 4; indeed it is not merely a reply but a reply in the very terms of the petition. Furthermore, although from the present arrangement of v. 6 we gather that Joseph is to give his father and his brethren 'the land of Goshen' to dwell in which is 'the best of the land'; v. 11 on the contrary narrates that Joseph placed his father and his brethren 'in the best of the land, in the land of Rameses.' A mere glance at the LXX version on the other hand reveals incongruities no less striking, but here these phenomena arise from different causes. For the Greek text represents an early stage in the elaboration of the Hebrew text, one in which the various documentary sources are laid loosely side by side and quite distinguishable from each other. The story of the presentation of Joseph's brothers appears plainly as two distinct narratives, which the redactor (not feeling any material divergence between them) compiled together as supplementary without making them to dove-tail. The MT on the other hand discloses the text of a later period harmonized by the clerical scribes whose critical acumen had become sufficiently sharpened to allow them to discern and feel dissatisfied with the rough-and-ready manner in which the various narratives of the Hexateuch had here been placed side by side. The needless repetitions, implied contradictions, double versions of the same episode offended their taste and impelled them to set about harmonizing the difficulties encountered. This they did rather unsuccessfully as we have proven above. They struck out the passage in v. 6 'And Jacob and his sons came into Egypt unto Joseph; and Pharaoh the king of Egypt heard of it' because the arrival of Jacob and his family had been recorded already a few lines above (46<sup>6</sup>, 47<sup>1</sup>) with considerable wealth of detail. And they amalgamated into v. 6, two verses, one belonging to P and the other to J. By this rearrangement of the sequence and by leaving the reader to infer that Goshen was identical with Rameses, the diaskauasts imparted to the straggling and incoherent story the appearance of a homogeneous whole. They hid the fragmentary nakedness of the compilation with the fig-leaves of omission and transposition. Ex 7<sup>15</sup> also exhibits traces of this later redactorial harmonizing. According to J Moses is commissioned to the children of Israel first (Ex. 3<sup>16</sup>). On his suggestion

that the Israelites might not believe in him, Jahve gives him three signs, in one of which an occasional staff is used as object (4<sup>2</sup>). According to E on the other hand, Moses is sent primarily to Pharaoh (Ex. 3<sup>10</sup>). The la<sup>15</sup>ter will harden his heart and not let the people go (3<sup>1</sup>). Therefore God will punish Egypt with plagues and freedom will thus result (3<sup>22</sup>). The 'staff of God' elsewhere alluded to in E is given to Moses as an instrument by means of which he is to work the wonders (4<sup>17</sup>). When J and E were combined it became necessary to identify these two staves and this result is accomplished in 7<sup>15</sup> (E) where an original reading 'which I gave in thy hand' or the like was harmonistically altered to 'which was turned into a serpent' -- a change which made the inference necessary that E's staff here is one and the same with J's staff in 4<sup>3</sup>. This alteration is preserved both in the MT and in the LXX. A similar redactional addition is likewise found however in the LXX in 4<sup>17</sup> where the inserted clause 'which was turned into a serpent' is certainly not genuine. The MT does not preserve the alteration. This fluctuation shows that both additions, viz. in 7<sup>15</sup> and 4<sup>17</sup> come from a very late period. In other words it indicates here the results of one stage in the long process of the 'continuous diaskeue.'

IV. WHEN ISRAEL'S NATIONAL LIFE WAS FINALLY EXTINGUISHED AND ITS WHOLE SOUL CONCENTRATED UPON THE PRESERVATION OF THE MONUMENTS OF THE PAST, TO THE EXACT TRANSMISSION OF THE RECEIVED TEXT, THE PROCESS OF 'TEXTUAL DIASKEUE' CAME TO AN ABRUPT CLOSE. THE INCONGRUITIES AND CONTRADICTIONS ON WHICH MODERN CRITICS LOVE TO GROUND THEIR ANTI-TRADITIONAL ARGUMENTS ARE IN PLAINEST EVIDENCE THAT THE EDITORS AND DIASKEUASTS HAD NOT FINISHED THEIR WORK WHEN THE TEXT THUS BECAME FIXED AND THE AGE OF TRADITION BEGAN. DIVERGENCES OF VOCABULARY, OF LITERARY STYLE; CONTRADICTORY VIEWS OF HISTORY AND RELIGION, NEEDLESS REPETITIONS, DOUBLE AND TREBLE VERSIONS OF SAME STORY--SUCH PHENOMENA REMAINED IN ABUNDANCE TO ATTEST THROUGHOUT THE AGES TO THE HEXATEUCH'S COMPOSITE CHARACTER AND TO ITS DOCUMENTARY ORIGIN. THE QUESTION SUGGESTS ITSELF IN VIEW OF THESE FACTS: HOW IS IT THAT THESE DIFFICULTIES, APPARENTLY SO REAL, SO PALPABLE,

REMAINED UNNOTICED UNTIL THE CRITICS CAME? THE FOLLOWING CHAPTERS ARE DESIGNED TO SHOW THAT THE DIFFICULTIES WERE NOTICED. THE EDITORS AND DIASKEUASTS WERE SUCCEEDED BY STUDENTS OF THE TEXT. HARMONISTIC INTERPRETATION TAKES THE PLACE OF HARMONISTIC CORRECTION AND INTERPOLATION. REDACTORIAL INGENUITY IS TRANSFERRED TO THE FIELD OF EXEGESIS, AND WHOLE SYSTEMS OF HERMENEUTICAL PROCEDURE ARE DEVISED WITH A VIEW TO HARMONIZING INCONGRUITIES AND CONTRADICTIONS WITH A TRADITIONAL ESTIMATE OF THE RECEIVED TEXT. IN MAINTAINING THIS THESIS AND TRACING THE DEVELOPMENT OF HARMONISTIC INTERPRETATION IT WILL BE SHOWN THAT WHILE THE SYSTEM IS OFTEN A TWISTING, TORTURING THUMB-SCREWING PROCESS ORIGINATING IN THAT PIOUS BUT MISAPPLIED ZEAL IN DEFENDING WHAT IS INDEFENSIBLE WHICH IS SO PAINFULLY CHARACTERISTIC OF ALL THE METHODS OF TRADITIONALISM, IT IS NO LESS FREQUENTLY MARKED BY EXAMPLES OF THAT PLENITUDE OF ERUDITION AND THAT SOLIDITY OF CRITICISM COMBINED WITH THAT REVERENCE FOR AN INSPIRED SCRIPTURE WHICH MORE THAN ANYTHING ELSE HAS PRESERVED THE TREASURE THEREIN ENSHRINED AS THE HERITAGE OF MANKIND.

CHAPTER I.

THE BEGINNINGS OF TRADITIONALISM.

THE HARMONISTIC CHARACTER OF POST-EXILIC PRACTICE. HARMON-  
ISTIC INTERPRETATIONS IN CHRONICLES, LXX, THE TARGUM. THE  
APOCRYPHA, JOSEPHUS AND PHILO.

I. WITH THE RESTORATION OF THE HEBREW STATE, THE INTRODUCTION OF THE PRIESTLY CODE AND ITS FUSION WITH THE EARLIER DOCUMENTS OF THE HEXATEUCH THE CULTUS BECAME BASED ON THREE DIVERGENT CODES. INCONGRUITIES AND CONTRADICTIONS IN THE DETAILS OF THE VARIOUS LAWS MADE A LITERAL OBSERVANCE OF ALL OF THEM IMPOSSIBLE. SUCH AN EXACT COMPLIANCE, HOWEVER, WAS RENDERED UNNECESSARY AT FIRST FROM THE FACT THAT ONLY ONE CODE WAS TAKEN AS STANDARD TO THE TOTAL EXCLUSION OF THE OTHER TWO. THE PRACTICE OF EARLY POST-EXILIC JUDAISM WAS ROOTED IN THE LATEST OF THE LARGE DOCUMENTS OF WHICH THE HEXATEUCH IS BUILT UP, THE PRIEST'S CODE, WITH ITS APPENDICES AND NOVELLAE. WITH THAT NAIVÉTÉ CHARACTERISTIC OF ANCIENT TIMES THE FACT WAS IGNORED THAT IN FOLLOWING ONE PART OF THE HEXATEUCH EXCLUSIVELY ANOTHER PART WAS ENTIRELY NEGLECTED.

It may be easily shown that the obligations in Nehemiah are based on P exclusively. For example according to D (Dt.1519-23) the firstling males of oxen and of sheep are to be eaten annually by the owner and his household at a sacrificial feast at the central sanctuary. According to JE (Ex.22<sup>29</sup>,30) on the other hand, the firstlings are to be presented to Jahwe on the eighth day from birth. A different disposition altogether of the firstlings is prescribed in P (Nm.1815-18). Instead of being eaten by the owner at the central sanctuary they are assigned to Aaron i.e. to the priests. Now Nehemiah (Neh.10<sup>36</sup>) recording the practice of his own time observes the law in P to the total exclusion of the conflicting laws in JE and D.

II. BUT SOON THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF CONTRADICTIONS HAD TO FORCE ITSELF UPON THE SCRIBES AND RITUALISTS WHEREUPON CONSISTENCY DEMANDED THAT THE DISCREPANCIES BE HARMONIZED. AS THE PRACTICE WAS ALREADY ROOTED IN THE PRIESTLY CODE RECOURSE WAS HAD TO EXEGESIS TO EXPLAIN AWAY THE DIVERGENCES WHICH WERE DETECTED IN THE OTHER LAW-BOOKS (JE AND D).

The earliest examples of this harmonistic exegesis are found in Chronicles. According to P (Ex.12<sup>3-6</sup>) a lamb (the phrase includes sheep or goats צאן-שׁוֹמֵר collectively kleinvieh) is to be used for the paschal offering. In D (Dt.16<sup>2</sup>) the paschal sacrifice is sheep and oxen (בקר). Jewish practice was based on P, but the contradiction with D was felt and had to be harmonized. The Chronicler, evidently recording the practice of his own time (for it is his habit to attribute to the period of the kings the ceremonial which was usual in his own days) states that Josiah gave the people for the paschal offerings thirty-thousand sheep and goats and three thousand oxen. (II. Chr. 35<sup>7</sup>). Combining this statement with II. Chr.35<sup>8,9,13</sup> and 30<sup>22,24</sup> we find that the oxen here mentioned by the Chronicler were used also for additional peace-offerings sacrificed during the seven days of Passover. Thus the conflict between D and P is harmonized in practice. The paschal offering, as such, was agreed to be a lamb, (according to P). D was made to agree with P by taking the 'passover' alluded to in the earlier code, not as the 'passover' properly so-called, but in a larger sense as including the paschal lamb (חֹמֶס) and also the peace-offering (שְׁלֵמִים).

Let us take another illustration. The paschal offering according to D (Dt. 16<sup>4</sup>) is to be boiled (בשל) while in P (Ex.12<sup>8</sup>) it is to be roasted (אש), boiling being here explicitly forbidden (אֲשֶׁל מִבְּשָׁל) (Dillmann ad.loc. Dt. asserts that בשל does not necessarily mean to boil. בשל = 'gar machen,' depending on the complement for its meaning to boil (אֲשֶׁל מִבְּשָׁל) or to roast (אֲשֶׁל בְּאֵשׁ). From the indefiniteness of the term in Dt.16<sup>7</sup> Dillmann infers that D does not lay stress on the exact mode of preparation. With Wellh. on the contrary (Geschic<sup>3</sup> 71 n.1) we may see in the two laws the usage of different times in which P is an advance on D.) The Chronicler (II. Chr. 35<sup>13</sup>) gives the practice of his time in substance as based on P, while the law in D is joined to it as referring not to the 'passover' proper, but again to 'holy offerings.' Thus in a later practice conflicting injunctions are explained away by a mode of harmonistic exegesis.

III. CONTRADICTIONS WERE ALSO FOUND AND HARMONIZED BY THE LXX TRANSLATORS, THE AUTHORS OF THE TARGUMS, OF THE APOCRYPHA AND LIKEWISE BY JOSEPHUS AND PHILO. HERE WE HAVE THE BEGINNINGS OF HALAKHA AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE TRADITIONALISTIC INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURES. WE SHALL EXAMINE THESE SEPARATELY. IT IS CLEAR WHAT A WIDE



FIELD FOR HARMONIZING THE PROCESS OF TRANSLATION OFFERS AS MOST OF THE CONTRADICTIONS CAN BE MADE TO AGREE BY THE MERE TURN OF A PHRASE. WITH REFERENCE TO THE LXX WE MUST CAREFULLY DISTINGUISH BETWEEN WHAT WE MAY PRESUPPOSE TO HAVE EXISTED IN THE MSS. FROM WHICH THE TRANSLATION WAS MADE AND THAT WHICH SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED BY THE TRANSLATOR. WE ARE CONCERNED HERE ONLY WITH THE LATTER.

In Dt. 16<sup>7</sup> the LXX reads 'and thou shalt boil and roast' (καὶ ἐψήσεις καὶ ὀπτήσεις) which harmonizes the difficulty described in the preceding example. Of course, the present LXX text may have a correction put after the corrigendum. At all events, the marginal glossator was a harmonist. In Nm. 4<sup>3</sup>, 23, 30, 39, 4<sup>7</sup> the limits for the period of Levitical service are fixed at thirty to fifty years respectively. In Nm. 8<sup>24</sup> apparently according to a different practice or theory the limits are from twenty-five to fifty years of age. The LXX harmonistically changes throughout Nm. 4 the number thirty unto twenty-five. In D (Dt. 14<sup>2</sup>) The Israelites are not to eat the flesh of any animal dying by itself. (נבלה) but it may be given to a stranger (גר) or sold to a foreigner (נוכרי), both of whom may eat it. According to P (Lv. 17<sup>15</sup>) the home-born or the stranger (גר) who eats נבלה must wash his garments and bathe, for he is unclean. The contradiction is real. In Dt. what is prohibited to the Israelite is allowed to the 'stranger' or foreign resident in Israel, whereas in Lev. it is forbidden to both alike. The Israelite and the stranger are placed on the same footing in P, on different footings in D. Now in Lv. 17<sup>15</sup> the LXX translates גר by προσήλυτος (as it does elsewhere fifty-four times in the Pentateuch: once γένος [Ex. 12<sup>19</sup> = גֵרִים] ) while in Dt. 14<sup>21</sup> it translates גר by πάροικος (as it does also in Gn. 15<sup>13</sup>, 23<sup>4</sup>, Ex. 22<sup>2</sup>, 18<sup>3</sup> † but there with good reason, for the context refers to strangers in the political sense, not in the religious sense. The unusual rendering πάροικος in Dt. is an attempt on the part of the LXX translators to harmonize the discrepancy with Lv. 17<sup>15</sup>. According to E (Ex. 33<sup>4B</sup>) the people as a spontaneous token of grief over bad news strip themselves of their ornaments. According to P (ibid 5B) the Israelites are commanded to take off their ornaments by Jahwe. As the MT now stands 5B commands the people to do what according to 4B they had done already. The LXX renders Ex. 33<sup>4B</sup> κατερένθησέν ἐν τενδικαῖς (They mourned in mourning garments) and the conflict is of

of what they receive to the priests: In D (Dt.14<sup>22-29</sup>) the tithe is spent partly at the sacred feasts partaken by the offerer and his household, partly in relief of the poor. In both cases the Levite is the recipient of Israel's benevolence. The contradiction is apparent. A large part of what in P is exclusively devoted to the support of the priestly tribe remains in D the property of the lay Israelite.

In Dt. 26<sup>12</sup> this difficulty is harmonized by an arbitrary rendering of the LXX. The words: 'which is the year of tithing' ( שנת התעשר ) it translates 'the second tithe' ( τὸ δεύτερον ἀπιδέκατον ) and the verse reads: When thou hast made an end of tithing in the third year, thou shalt give a second tithe unto the Levite and unto the fatherless, the widow, etc.' According to this the tithe in D does not refer in any way to the tithe named in Lw-Nm, but to a second or additional tithe levied (after the deduction of the levitical tithe) on the remaining nine-tenths of the produce and appropriated not like the first tithe to the support of the priestly tribe, but to public feasts and charities.

IV. THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS ARE SOURCES FOR THE EARLY HALAKHAS AND WE MAY EXPECT TO FIND IN THEM ALSO TRACES OF HARMONISTIC PRACTICE.

In Job. 1<sup>7</sup> the idea of the 'second tithe' is explicitly introduced indicating the harmonistic practice based on P and D.

V. IN JOSEPHUS AND PHILO ALSO MAY BE TRACED THE PROGRESS OF HARMONISTIC HALAKHA. JOSEPHUS REPRODUCES THE HISTORY OF THE NATION IN ADDITION TO THE PRACTICE CURRENT IN HIS TIME. WE MAY THEREFORE EXPECT TO FIND IN HIS WORK HARMONISTIC INTERPRETATIONS OF CONTRADICTIONS IN THE NARRATIVES OF THE HEXATEUCH IN ADDITION TO THOSE OF DISCREPANCIES IN THE CODES.

According to D (Dt.18<sup>3</sup>). The revenues of the priests from the sacrifice are the shoulder, the two cheeks and the maw. In direct contradiction P (Lv.7<sup>32-34</sup>) prescribes as the priests' due, the breast and the right thigh. In Jos. (Antiq. LV, 4,4) and Philo (Praem. sacer. § 3, ed. Maughey II. 235) the contradiction is harmonized. The reference in D is not to sacrifice at all, but to animals slaughtered at home for domestic use.

course obviated.

4, 2

According to JE (Ex. 42, 17, 20) Moses is commanded to do signs with his rod or the 'rod of God'. In P (Ex. 78, 9) Aaron is the agent and Aaron's rod is the instrument. The only way to harmonize this discrepancy is to identify the rods and leave the reader to infer that Moses had in the meantime given Aaron his own rod. Thus in 7<sup>9</sup> Moses ought to have said Take my rod ( קַח מִסֵּבֶלִי ) or supply the rod ( קַח מִסֵּבֶלִי ) and in 7<sup>10</sup> where the command is executed Aaron should not have cast down his staff ( וַיִּטְּשֵׁהוּ ) but again supply the staff ( קַח מִסֵּבֶלִי ) (the staff of Moses). These necessary harmonistic changes appear in the LXX. In both places for 'thy staff' ( קַח מִסֵּבֶלִי ) 7<sup>9</sup> and 'his staff' ( וַיִּטְּשֵׁהוּ ) 7<sup>10</sup>, it reads the staff ( τὴν ῥάβδον ). Inconsistently enough however, in 7<sup>19</sup>, where again we should harmonistically require 'the' staff, it preserves the MT קַח מִסֵּבֶלִי 'thy' staff and reads τὴν ῥάβδον αὐτοῦ

A striking chronological inaccuracy arising from the composite character of the narratives is neatly harmonized in the LXX. In Ex. 12<sup>40</sup> the sojourning of the Israelites in Egypt (presumably meaning from the emigration of Jacob into Egypt to the Exodus under Moses) is estimated at 430 years. Two difficulties arise from this statement. According to Gn. 15<sup>13-16</sup> Abram's seed is to return in the fourth generations. Four generations are by no means 430 years. Secondly many genealogies fail to agree with the computation of Ex. 12<sup>40</sup>, notably the genealogy of Moses. For his grandfather Kohath son of Levi, who was already born at the period of emigration (Gn. 46<sup>8, 11</sup>) lived 133 years (Ex. 6<sup>18</sup>), Amram, his father, died at the age of 137 years (Ex. 6<sup>20</sup>) and he himself at the time of the Exodus was 80 years of age (Ex. 7<sup>7</sup>). All of this added together gives only 350 yrs., which must still be considerably shortened by deducting the years of Kohath before the emigration and the contemporary years of fathers and sons. Evidently 430 years is much too large an estimate for the period between Jacob's emigration and the exodus under Moses. The LXX. now translates Ex. 12<sup>40</sup>: 'The sojourning of the children of Israel which they sojourned in Egypt and in the land of Canaan was 430 years. (so B[Vat.]). The insertion of the phrase 'and in the land of Canaan' harmonizes the discrepancy, for the 'sojourning' is now reckoned from the time of the call of Abram and his emigration. The Alex. Cod.<sup>(A)</sup> brings this interpretation out still more clearly by translating: The sojourning of the children of Israel and of their fathers which they sojourned in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan was 430 years. According to P (Nm. 18<sup>21-28</sup>) the tithe is appropriated entirely to the maintenance of the priestly tribe being paid in the first place to the Levites, who in turn pay a tenth

Again, Josephus (Antiq. IV. 8,22) records the same harmony in the matter of the tithe as the LXX and Tob. and speaks of the 'second tithe' as a law of Moses.

The 430 years' sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt is harmonistically reckoned (Antiq. II. 15,2) from the time when our forefather Abraham came into Canaan, but 215 years only after Jacob removed into Egypt. Again, (Contra Apion. 1, 33) 'Joseph died four generations before Moses which four generations make almost 170 years. Similarly, (Antiq. 11,9,6) 'Abraham was Moses' ancestor in the seventh generation.'

According to E (Ex. 31, 18<sup>1</sup>) the name of the father-in-law of Moses is given as Jethro. (Ex. 4<sup>18</sup> it is Jether). According to Ex. 2<sup>18</sup> he is called Re'uel while in J (Nm. 10<sup>29</sup>) he is named Re'uel or Hobab, according as either is taken in apposition with the word father-in-law. Josephus (Antiq. II. 12,1) says that Jethro is one of the names of Raguel as a mere title of honor:--an assertion which at least in part removes the contradiction.

VI. ALTHOUGH A CONSIDERATION OF THE TARGUMS PROPERLY BELONGS TO THE NEXT CHAPTER, WE GIVE IT HERE BECAUSE AS TRANSLATIONS THEY EXHIBIT THE SAME FACILITIES FOR HARMONISTIC INTERPRETATION AS DO THE OLDER TRANSLATIONS.

The Pal. Targ. I ad Ex. 12<sup>40</sup> translates 'and the days which the children of Israel stayed in Egypt were 30 times 7 years ( תלתין שסין זשנין ) that is 210 years, but 430 years had elapsed from that time when Yahwe spoke to Abraham on the 15th day of Nisan between the dissected parts of the animals (Gn. 15<sup>10-14</sup>).

In Ex. 25-31 (P) Moses is on the mount. He is instructed about the tabernacle that Yahwe may dwell in the midst of Israel. In the meantime Israel had erected the golden calf and in Ex. 32-34 (JE) the people are indeed pardoned for the offense, but the pardon is accompanied by punishment. Yahwe can no longer go in the midst of them (Ex. 33<sup>3</sup>). The tabernacle therefore is pitched outside the camp. (Ex. 33<sup>7</sup>). Now in Ex. 35 (P) the construction of the priestly tabernacle within which Yahwe is to dwell in the center of the camp proceeds without any reference to the existence of the tabernacle in 33 standing outside the camp. The difficulty is harmonized by a translation in Onkelos. The tabernacle in Ex. 33 is not the same as the tabernacle par excellence in Ex. 35. The words 'the tent of meeting' in Ex. 33<sup>7</sup> ( אהל מועד ), though elsewhere constantly translated

by Targ. Onkelos משכן בית אולפנו are here rendered By the tent of meeting then in Ex.33 we are to understand a mere school-house, and not a priestly tabernacle as in Ex. 35.

As we have seen above (Ch.I§2) the paschal offering according to P (Ex.12<sup>3</sup>) is a lamb (שֶׁה) while in D (Dt.16<sup>2</sup>) it is "sheep and oxen" (צֶמֶן וּבָקָר) Targ. Onq. evidently felt the discrepancy, for in Dt. 16<sup>2</sup> he translates 'And thou shalt sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God of the sheep but the holy offerings of the oxen' (וּנְכַסְתָּ קִדְשֵׁי מִן תּוֹרֵי). by which harmonistic insertion the difficulty is removed. The contradiction of the stranger (גֵר) (See Ch.II. § III) who according to D may eat the flesh of any animal dying by itself (וּבְלֵה), but according to P is forbidden to do so is felt by Targ. Onq. and met in the same way as in the older LXX translation. It translates (Dt. 14<sup>21</sup>) the word גֵר by the unusual לְתוֹבָה עֵינִי (as in Dt.28<sup>43</sup> 1421<sup>1</sup> גֵר (וּתְבוּבָה עֵינִי) Lv.25<sup>47</sup>†). The common renderings are גֵר (47 times) and גֵר (Gn. 15<sup>13</sup> 23<sup>4</sup>, Ex.22<sup>2</sup> 18<sup>3</sup> 22206 239, Lv.19<sup>34</sup> 25<sup>23</sup> Dt.10<sup>29</sup>†).

The Targum evidently wishes it to be understood that the גֵר in Lv.17<sup>15</sup> is not the same as the גֵר in Dt.14<sup>21</sup>. According to E (Ex.12<sup>31</sup>) and D (Dt.16<sup>1</sup>) the Israelites left Egypt stealthily in the night לַיְלָה. But P presents a different view of the matter. The Exodus was conducted openly (בַּיּוֹם) (Ex.11<sup>8</sup>) and in the light of day on the 'morrow of the passover' (מִמָּחֳרַת הַפֶּסַח) (Nm.33<sup>3</sup>). A translator who perceives the incongruity and wishes to leave his readers in no doubt as to the exact circumstances would adopt one account and harmonize the other. This the Targ. Onq. does. In Dt.16<sup>1B</sup> for the words 'for in the month of Abib the Lord thy God brought thee forth out of Egypt by night' it reads 'for in the month of Abib the Lord thy God brought thee forth out of Egypt and did wonders for thee in the night' (וַעֲבַד לְךָ נִסִּים [בַּלַּיְלָא] ed. Berliner, omitted in the Regia). From this verse then Onq. wishes it to be understood that only wonders but no Exodus came to pass at night. The translation here adopts the account which declares the Exodus to have taken place in the day. But whether that account is adopted finally by Targ. Onq. it is rather difficult to say. For by a similar process of harmonizing in the other passage we are left to infer that the Exodus took place in the night. For in Nm.33<sup>3</sup> the words 'the morrow of the passover' (מִמָּחֳרַת הַפֶּסַח) are rendered 'after the passover' (מִבְּתַר פֶּסַח) ed. Berliner, elsewhere 'יָמָּה טוֹבָה דִּבְ' that is at night. It is improbable that the same translator could wish us to adopt both interpretations.

[בַּלַּיְלָא] presupposes מִבְּתַר יָמָּה טוֹבָה דִּבְ while [בַּלַּיְלָא] presupposes מִבְּתַר פֶּסַח. The harmonistic tendency is at any rate proven.

As a result of its composite character the narratives of the Hexateuch often give us more or less widely diverging representations of one and the same event or person. The two accounts of the origin of the name Beer-sheba is an example of this phenomenon, which appears to have given considerable trouble to Onkelos. According to E (Gn.21<sup>22</sup>) Abraham while dwelling at the well of Beer-sheba receives a visit from Abimelech accompanied by his general Phicol. <sup>כא</sup> The prince convinced of Yahwe's love for the patriarch, desires to make a treaty (21<sup>23</sup>). Abraham consents and sets apart seven lambs as a pledge, upon the receipt of which Abimelech is to declare that he recognizes the well as Abraham's property.(v.30). So the well was called Beer-sheba, i.e. "The well of the seven," because the oath had been taken by it. (v.32). The stress of E's narrative seems to be on the certification of Abraham's right to the well.

In J (Gn.26<sup>23</sup>) Abimelech, together with Ahuzzath, his minister of state, and Phicol, his general, appear before Isaac at the well of Beer-sheba and desire to make a treaty because they see the help he receives at the hands of Yahwe (v.28). Isaac readily consents and the alliance is confirmed by a banquet (v.30) and an oath (v.31). The same day Isaac's men tell him of a well which they had found whereupon he gives it the name of Shiba, i.e. 'oath.'(v.33). So the city which lies close by it is still called Beer-sheba, i.e. "The well of the oath." In this account the naming of the well is given merely as a witness to the covenant and the stress is laid upon the friendship of Abimelech and the patriarch. Even a traditionalist might see at a glance that the story in Gn.26 is but an echo of the earlier legend in which Abraham appears as the agent. The remarkable agreement between the two not only in the main features, but in such small detail as the use of proper names would naturally force the question,--Is not the Abimelech in Gn.21 and the Abimelech in Gn.26 one and the same person, and do not both chapters refer after all to the very same event. Onkelos was certainly aware of the incongruity for the question is answered for us in his translation of Gn.26<sup>28</sup> where Abimelech says to Isaac: 'Let there now be an oath betwixt us, even betwixt us and thee' (תהי נא אלה בינותנו ביננו ובינך). These words are thus rendered in Targ.Onq. 'Let the oath which existed between our fathers be ratified now between us and thee' (תתקיים כעת ביננו ובינך). On this interpretation Abimelech in Gn.26 is the son of the Abimelech in Gn.21 and this harmony of the parallel accounts probably implied already by the Redactor is made explicit in the translation of Onkelos.

CHAPTER II.

TRADITIONALISM      DEVELOPED.

HARMONISTIC TERMINOLOGY.      HARMONISTIC HERMENEUTIC PRINCIPLES.      JEW-  
ISH PRACTICE WHOLLY HARMONISTIC.

I. IN THE PRECEDING PAGES WE HAVE TRACED THE ORIGIN AND EARLY PROGRESS OF HARMONISTIC EXEGESIS. WE HAVE SEEN HOW THE DIM CONSCIOUSNESS OF INTERNAL CONTRADICTIONS AND INCONGRUITIES IN THE 'BOOKS OF MOSES' BETRAYED ITSELF IN SLIGHT SPORADIC CHANGES IN THE TEXT ITSELF AND IN A COMPROMISE PRACTICE ADJUSTED TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF WHAT WERE FELT TO BE DIVERGENT CODES. IN THE MISHNIC-TALMUDIC LITERATURE THIS HARMONISTIC TENDENCY ACQUIRES A DISTINCTNESS, A FIRMNESS OF OUTLINE AND A CONSISTENCY OF DIRECTION WHICH IS TO BE EXPLAINED ONLY AS ARISING FROM A STARTLING APPRECIATION OF INCONGRUITIES IN MATTERS OF MINUTEST DETAIL. NOTHING ATTESTS MORE STRONGLY TO THIS NOW HIGHLY DEVELOPED SENSE THAN THE USE DURING THIS PERIOD OF TECHNICAL TERMS AND PHRASES TO EXPRESS THE PECULIAR PHENOMENA OF PENTA-TEUCHAL DISCREPANCIES AND THE MANNER IN WHICH THEY ARE TO BE HARMONIZED.

We shall cite a few examples of this harmonistic terminology. Texts are said to belie (one another) (הכחיש זה את זה) used also of witnesses (Cf Ket 20<sup>a</sup>) and testimony (ibid). A familiar term is סתר to tear down (a building, opp. בנה Sabb.73d); hence to overthrow, annul, reverse (a judge's opinion Sabb.31<sup>a</sup>); finally therefore to contradict (e.g. Ezekiel contradicts the Torá Sabb. 13b etc.) Another harmonistic phrase is הכריע to turn the scale (cf. B.B.89<sup>a</sup>); decide (Sabb.39B ואתו מכריע שנים חלוקין). In the later methodological works we find also ישב to settle, וישבו המקראות, and the significant term סתירה לגמרי an absolute contradiction.

11. AS TRADITIONALISM PROGRESSED THE HARMONISTIC EXEGETICAL EXPEDIENTS IN VOGUE IN THE GREAT TALMUDIC SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES CRYSTALLIZED INTO WELL-DEFINED CANONS OF INTERPRETATION, SANCTIONED BY RABBINIC AUTHORITY. THE CORYPHEUS OF THIS HEMENEUTICAL PRACTICE WAS R. ISHMAEL, WHO ENLARGED THE SEVEN RULES OF HILLEL TO THIRTEEN, THE LAST OF WHICH IS ENTIRELY ORIGINAL WITH HIM. ACCORDING TO THE TEXT--



ACCEPTED BY ABRAHAM <sup>B</sup> ~~Q~~. DAVID--FOUND IN THE SIPHRA, IT WOULD SEEM, HOWEVER, THAT THIS RULE ALSO WAS ONE OF THE SEVEN CANONS OF HILLEL. ALTHOUGH THE SIPHRA VERSION OF THE TEXT IS ALSO GIVEN IN THE TOSEPTA SANHEDRIN ch.7<sup>11</sup> MS.ERFURT, IT SEEMS THAT THE TEXT IS CORRUPT AND THAT WE SHOULD READ WITH THE VIENNA MS. AND THE PRINTED EDITIONS,

CF. ~~ABQ~~ ABOTH DERABBI NATHAN ch.37<sup>10</sup>: א . AT ANY RATE, THIS THIRTEENTH RULE IS THE FIRST CANON OF HARMONISTIC INTERPRETATION AND READS AS FOLLOWS: 'TWO TEXTS CONTRADICTING EACH OTHER ARE TO BE RECONCILED BY A THIRD. שני כתובים המכחישים זה את זה קץ שיבוא הכתוב השלישי. Siphra Introd. ויכריע ביניהם

The stereotyped <sup>f</sup>worm of this kind of argumentation is as follows: One text says ( כתוב אחר אומר )..... And another text says ( וכתוב אחר אומר )..... But a third harmonizes the discrepancy..... For example, R. Akiba says: One text declares the paschal offering to be sheep and oxen, while another says that it is a lamb. (cf.ch.ii.§ 2). Say therefore that this is a hermeneutic principle in the Tora, "Two verses which stand apposed and contradict one another are to be harmonized by a third." Now Scripture says in Ex.12<sup>21B</sup> 'Take you a lamb according to your families and kill the passover.' Hence we know that only a lamb can be used for the paschal offering but not oxen. (Mekilatha Sect. א2)

Again Ex.20<sup>22</sup> asserts that Yahwe spoke from heaven while Ex.19<sup>20</sup> implies that He spoke from Mt. Sinai. The contradiction is removed by Dt. Dt.4<sup>36</sup>, which says 'Out of heaven he made thee hear his voice.....and upon earth he made thee to see his great fire.' (Mekil.תרו.ט.ט )

III. THE SUPERFICIAL UNITY OF THE HEXATEUCH ONCE SEEN TO BE FALLACIOUS, BY AN UNDUE EXTENSION OF THE HARMONISTIC PRINCIPLE THE TALUMDIC DOCTORS OFTEN SEE DIFFICULTIES WHERE NONE EXIST AND TRY TO REMOVE INCONGRUITIES WHICH ARE WHOLLY IMAGINARY. THE FOLLOWING ANECDOTE ILLUSTRATES THE ENCOURAGEMENT WITH WHICH THE PERCEPTION OF CONTRADICTIONS WAS EVERYWHERE MET AND HOW THE HARMONISTIC TENDENCY WAS FOSTERED BY TEACHERS IN THE MINDS OF THEIR PUPILS. RABA WHILE IN-

STRUCTURING HIS SON ASKED THE FOLLOWING QUESTION: HOW MAY THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN II.SAM. 24<sup>24</sup>, WHERE DAVID IS SAID TO HAVE BOUGHT A THRESHING-FLOOR FOR 50 SHEKELS OF SILVER, BE HARMONIZED WITH I.CHR. 21<sup>25</sup>, WHERE HE IS SAID TO HAVE PAID SIX HUNDRED SHEKELS OF GOLD? TO WHICH THE BRIGHT LAD READILY RESPONDED THAT THE 50 SHEKELS IN II. SAM. MEANS 50 FOR EACH TRIBE, AND SINCE THERE ARE TWELVE TRIBES, DAVID AS IS TRULY SAID IN II.CHR. PAID 600 SHEKELS FOR HIS THRESHING-FLOOR. IT IS NOT STRANGE, THEREFORE, THAT THIS PROPENSITY FOR CLEVER HARMONIZING SHOULD SOMETIMES CAUSE THE TRADITIONALISTS TO REGARD THEIR TORA AS A CONGERIES OF IMAGINARY RIDDLES TO THE SOLUTION OF WHICH THEY MUST DEDICATE THEIR LIVES.

Let us examine a few examples of the harmonizing of imaginary difficulties by the thirteenth canon of R.Ishmael. From Lv.16<sup>1</sup> it is assumed that the sons of Aaron met death for approaching God, but according to Lv. 10<sup>1</sup>, they paid the penalty for offering a 'strange fire.' The 'contradiction' is harmonized by Nm.26<sup>21</sup>, where the punishment is plainly indicated as resulting from the offering of 'strange fire' (Siphra אֶת־הָאֵשׁ הַזֵּה).

Again from Dt.12<sup>5</sup> Yahwe shall choose a habitation out of all your tribes, but Dt. 12<sup>14</sup> says that the place shall be chosen in one of the tribes, an ambiguity which arises merely in stylistic awkwardness. The imaginary contradiction is removed by Dt.33<sup>12</sup>, where the sanctuary is said to rest in Benjamin ('one of thy tribes'). (Siphre דברים sec.62 )

IV. IT IS EXPLAINED BY R. ABRAHAM b. DAVID OF POSQUIERES (ר' אבדו ) IN COMMENTING ON THE THIRTEENTH RULE OF R. ISHMAEL THAT IN ORDER TO HARMONIZE TWO CONFLICTING TEXTS A THIRD ONE IS NOT ALWAYS IMPERATIVE. SCRIPTURE INDEED HE GOES ON TO SAY, OCCASIONALLY EMPLOYS THIS METHOD, BUT ONLY BECAUSE IT IS OBVIOUSLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR IT TO USE ANY OTHER. THE ONLY JUST INFERENCE TO BE DRAWN FROM THE USE OF SCRIPTURE IN THIS CONNECTION IS THAT A CONTRADICTION MUST AT

ALL HAZARDS BE HARMONIZED. BUT TO DO THIS WE NEED NOT CONFINE OURSELVES TO ANY PARTICULAR NORM. ON THE CONTRARY, WE ARE OPEN TO CHOOSE ANY METHOD WHICH REASON MAY SUGGEST. (SIPHRA. INTRO.CH.)

Thus it is quite unnecessary to employ Dt.33<sup>12</sup> to remove the difficulty between one of thy tribes 12<sup>5</sup> and all of thy tribes 12<sup>14</sup> (cf.above § 2). Dt.12<sup>5</sup> simply refers to the locality of the sanctuary, Dt. 12<sup>14</sup> to the monetary contributions. Or again, the first refers to Jerusalem, the second to the tabernacle at Shiloh. Other examples are purely Haggadic. We are relieved from doubt, for example, as to whether Aaron's sons died for approaching God or for offering strange fire by the assurance that either act is sufficient to have killed them (Siphra אָהֲרֹן ) Or again, R.Akiba explains the contradiction between Yawhe's speaking from heaven and Yawhe's speaking from Mt. Sinai by the assertion that God inclined the heaven to the top of the mountain and thus spoke from both places at the same time.

Note. Throughout the Talmud we find several Amoraim calling attention to minute contradictions and incongruities which they harmonize by an argument of the same general character as the thirteenth canon of R. Ishmael. Its stereotyped form is as follows: A certain teacher asked the following question of contradiction between two texts ( פְּלוֹי רַמִּי ) It is said ( נִתְּב )..... and it is said elsewhere ( וְנִתְּב )..... Answer. There is no contradiction ( לֹא קִשְׁיָא ). (cf.Ber.35 B 55B; Erubin 54a 63a etc.). Thus R.Assi asks a question of contradiction. In Gn.11<sup>2</sup> (P) The earth brought forth grass on the third day, before the creation of man. In Gn. 2 (J) Man was created before the grass. The answer is that the grass sprouted forth on Tuesday and then did not continue to grow. When Adam came he prayed and the gentle rain fell whereupon the grass grew up once more. This is to tell thee that God answers the prayer of the righteous. (Hullin 60 B).

Again, R.Abahu asks a question of contradiction. In Gn. 1<sup>27</sup> 5<sup>1</sup> (P) it is said of the first human beings on the earth 'male and female he created them.' But in Gn.2<sup>22-24</sup> man is created first and woman afterward. The imaginary contradiction is harmonized by the startling information that the protoplast was a hermaphrodite. (Erubin 18 a). Even differences of style were noticed and harmonized:-- Gn.11 (P) heaven and earth contra Gn.24B (J) earth and heaven.

From these differences the school of Shammai say heaven was created first, and the school of Hillel, opposing them, assert that the earth was created first. (Gen.Rab.sec.1 fin) Again the slight variations in the

different accounts of the decalogue Dt.5 (D) and Ex.20 (E) were noticed and harmonized. Especially in the fourth commandment Remember (זכור) and Observe (שמור). The harmony offered is that both words were uttered at one and the same time (שניהם נאמרו ביגוד אחד). Even the different motives ascribed for resting on Sabbath in the two accounts were felt and the harmony is preserved in the blessing which every pious Israelite pronounces over his wine (קדוש) (cf. Mekilatha פ"ה.נ"ג; Shebnoth 20b; Rosh Has 27b; Pal. Medarim 3§1; Pal. Shebnoth 3 §5; Cant. Rab. 28 Siphre כ"ט תנ"א). For further examples cf. also Ber. 7a where a difference is felt between Ex.34, 'God visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children' and Dt.24, 'children are not slain on account of the sins of their fathers'; Rosh Hass. 17 B where the proselyte Valeria asks R. Gamaliel to harmonize Dt.10 where God is said to be impartial with Nm.7, where God looks with favor upon Israel; cf. also Sotah 27 B, Arachin 29a, Pesachim 68B.

V. THE THIRTEEN HERMENEUTIC RULES OF R. ISHMAEL WERE ENLARGED BY R. ELIEZER, SON OF R. JOSE, THE GALILEAN, TO THE NUMBER OF THIRTY-TWO. R. ELIEZER'S THIRTY-SECOND PRINCIPLE IS A CANON OF INTERPRETATION DESIGNED TO HARMONIZE ALL INCONGRUITIES ARISING FROM LACK OF CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER, ILLOGICAL SEQUENCE, ETC., IN THE TORAH. (CF. BUILDING OF THE TABERNACLE, CH. II. § VI., JA COB BEFORE PHARAOH CH. I. § III. ETC.) THE PRINCIPLE IS AS FOLLOWS: THERE IS NO CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER IN THE TORA. אין סידור במורה. BY THIS RULE R. ELIEZER MEANS THAT THE AUTHOR OF THE TORA SIMPLY DID NOT AIM AT CHRONOLOGICAL ACCURACY. HIS MAIN OBJECT WAS FAR FROM THAT. IT IS CERTAINLY INSTRUCTIVE TO COMPARE THIS VIEW WITH THAT OF KUEN. (p. 4) WHO SEES IN THE TORA 'A THREAD WHICH RUNS THROUGH THE WHOLE AND WHICH SO HOLDS IT TOGETHER AS UTTERLY TO EXCLUDE ANY IDEA OF ITS BEING A MERE CHANCE ASSEMBLAGE OF HETEROGENEOUS ELEMENTS.'

Examples of this harmony may be cited by the score. We

select two. Nm. describes the dedication of the tabernacle of the tent of meeting. From Ex.40l this must have taken place on the first day of the first month of the second year after the departure from Egypt. But in Nm. 11 we are already in the first day of the second month of the second year after the Exodus. 'There is no chronological order in the Tora.'

Again, referring to Nm. 91 where an event is related to have occurred in the first month of the second year after the Exodus in connection with Nm.11, where another event is related as having occurred in the second month of the second year the Talmud asks: 'Why should not the event of the first month be told first and the event of the second month next? R. Menashiah b. Halaftha in the name of Rab answers: 'Say this that there is no chronological order in the Tora. (Pesahim 6B). To which Rashi adds (ad.loc.) The Tora does not aim to preserve chronological consistency.

( לא הקפידה תורה על סדר מוקדם ומאוחר )

VI. IT IS NOTEWORTHY THAT THE RABBIS ARE CAUTIOUS TO TELL US THAT THE PRINCIPLE ASSERTING THE ABSENCE OF CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER IN THE TORAH HOLDS ONLY GOOD WITH REFERENCE TO THE LARGER SECTIONS: WITHIN ONE SECTION ORDER IS SUPPOSED TO EXIST. HENCE THE RULE IN QUESTION IS TERMED 'ON SEQUENCE OF LARGER SECTIONS.' ( מוקדם ומאוחר בפרשיות ).

The rationale of this limitation is found in the following argument. R. Papa in reply to R. Menashiah (cf. above) says that the principle of מוקדם ומאוחר holds good only between large sections ( בתרי עיניי ), but does not hold good in one and the same section. For if there were no chronological order at all in the Tora, we could never apply the canons of 'General and Particular' and 'Particulars and General.' (In the case of General and Particular, the General includes nothing but the Particular = כלל יפרט כלל יפרט ) 'in the case of Particulars and General, the general term adds to the contents of the particulars, and we include (everything belonging to this general) כולל הכל מסיף על הפרט ומרבינו הכל (Mielziner, p.164 f.). It is obvious that these two canons are impracticable if the sequence, on which they are based, is only apparent. Hence the principle that 'the rule of General and Particular applies only when both are found in one and the same passage of the Law, but not when in different passages כלל יפרט במרוחקין זה מזה לא דרשינן (Mielziner, p.168). B. q.85a Men 55b' (Mielziner, p.168).

For further examples of the application of the canon mentioned in V cf Mekilatha p. נח ; Siphre <sup>גזירא</sup> sec. 6 4; p. Megilla 70d, l.18 from the bottom, R.has.56 b,l.13-14, Segalim 49d, l.7 from the bottom, Sota 22d,l.30 (in the latter passage the formula reads <sup>בתורה</sup> אין מוקדם ומאוחר ); Nm.r.ch.9; Ecc.r.ad 112; Ruth r.ad 24.

VII. ANOTHER CANON OF R. ELIEZER, SON OF B. JOSE, THE GALILEAN, CALCULATED TO REMOVE INCONGRUITIES ARISING FROM DIVERGENT DOUBLETS, DUPLICATE ACCOUNTS OF THE SAME EVENT, HISTORICAL REPETITIONS, ETC. IS THE THIRTEENTH. 'A DESCRIPTIVE SPECIFIED NARRATIVE FOLLOWING A CONCISE GENERAL STATEMENT IS TO BE TAKEN AS AN EXPLICATION OF THE LATTER AND AS IDENTICAL WITH IT. ( כלל שלאחריו מעשה הוא פרטו של ראשון )

By means of this the differences in the two accounts of the creation before noted (cf.above § 3) are harmonized. ✓ Gn.24B-223 (J) is taken as the explication of Gn.11-24 (P) and as identical with it.

VIII. FOR PURPOSES SIMILAR TO THOSE OF THE THIRTEENTH CANON OF R.ELIEZER, AN ANONYMOUS PRINCIPLE WAS USED AT A LATER DATE IN THE MISHNIC TALMUDIC PERIOD. 'NOTHING IS REPEATED IN THE TORA WITHOUT THE ADDITION OF SOME FACTOR OMITTED IN THE FIRST ACCOUNT.' ( מזה בתורה כל פרשה שנאמרה במקום אחד וחזר ושנאה במקום אחר לא שנאה מזה בתורה כל פרשה שנאמרה במקום אחד וחזר ושנאה במקום אחר על שחיסר בה דבר אחד Men 10<sup>a</sup> Bek 43 <sup>א</sup> )

For example, according to Lv.61 ff, if a man defraud his neighbor, he shall restore all he has taken and one fifth more. In addition he shall make a guilt offering to the priest. In Nm. 55ff the same law is repeated. Accord-

ing to the Rabbis, the repetition is due to the fact that an addition has to be made to the provisions of Lv.61. And this addition is to be found in Nm.58, where it is commanded that if the person defrauded dies without issue or kinsmen, the substitution is to be made to the priests.

IX. THE MISHNIC TALMUDIC LITERATURE IS SUPPOSED DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY TO DEAL WITH LAWS BEARING ON CONDUCT AND BASED ON THE TORA. WHILE COMING FROM A TIME SUBSEQUENT TO THE FALL OF JERUSALEM, IT REGULATES THE LIFE OF THE JEW IN MATTERS WHICH THOUGH NOT REALIZABLE AT PRESENT (e.g. THE TEMPLE SERVICES AND THINGS CONNECTED THEREWITH) ARE NEVERTHELESS TO BE REVIVED IN FULL GLORY AT SOME FUTURE DAY. EVERY PENTATEUCHAL LAW, THEREFORE, MUST BE POSITIVELY STATED, IN TERMS WHICH RENDER THIS REALIZATION POSSIBLE. WHETHER IT IS THE LAW OF THE LEVIRATE OR OF THE CENTRALIZATION OF THE CULTURE, THERE MUST BE POSITIVE KNOWLEDGE AND AGREEMENT AS TO WHAT IS LAW AND WHAT IS NOT. IT IS EVIDENT THEN THAT THE LEGAL PORTIONS OF THE TORA,-- THOUGH THEY COME FROM DIFFERENT SOURCES AND DIFFERENT PERIODS, AND ARE THEREFORE OFTEN MUTUALLY CONTRADICTORY,--MUST BE REDUCED TO UNITY IN THE MISHNA AND TALMUD. THUS INDEED THE LEGAL PRACTICE OF THE MISHNIC-TALMUDIC LITERATURE IS WHOLLY HARMONISTIC.

In the matter of the tithe for example the harmony made between D and P in the old versions (cf. above p. 15 f. ) is already presupposed in the Mishnic Talmudic literature, where we meet with the terms 'First Tithe ( מקשר ראשון ) and 'Second Tithe' ( מקשר שני ) (cf. Mishna טע 5<sup>6</sup> ) n Again (cf. above p. 16 ) the parts of the priestly revenues mentioned in Dt.18<sup>3</sup> are to be given from the profane animals; those in Lv.7 refer to the sacred gifts. ( בחלין אבל לא במוקדשין ) cf. Hullin 101). 10<sup>1</sup>  
Similarly (cf. above p. 13 ) the passover of sheep and oxen in Dt.162 means the peace offerings termed Hagigah, which it was usual to offer on the same day as the passover or the following day. Thus the difficulty with Ex.12<sup>3-6</sup>,

where the passover prescribed is a lamb, is removed (cf. Mishna Pesahin 63-4).

According to Ex.216, Dt.1517, a person who voluntarily enslaves himself shall serve forever; according to Lv.2540 he shall serve only until the year of Jubilee. The Mekilata asserts that to serve till Jubilee means to serve forever.  $\text{לְעוֹלָם} = \text{לְעוֹלָם} = \text{לְעוֹלָם}$  (cf. Mekilata p.84, Kidd.15b.)

According to Dt.152 a Hebrew woman sold as a slave is to be released in the seventh year as in the case of a Hebrew man. In Ex.217, although a woman who comes into service with her husband receives her freedom when he does (v.3), a daughter sold by her father as a bond-woman is on a different footing. She is not to go out as bondmen do; according to tradition, Ex.217 'she shall not go out as the men-servants do' is interpreted to mean that if she is injured as in Ex.2127, she is not given her freedom, but must serve her seven years when she is manumitted as the ordinary Hebrew slave, according to Dt.1512. (cf. Mekilata p.85, Siphre 118  $\text{גַּרְוָה}$ , Kidd.20b.)

*p. 75<sup>a</sup>, 78<sup>a</sup>*  
 In Lv.1816,20,21 marriage with a brother's wife (widow) is forbidden. In Dt.255-10 marriage with a brother's wife is directly enjoined if the brother died without issue. According to some critics (Benz. Arch. p.346) the law in P is supposed to abrogate the law in D. Others (Dr. Dt. p.285) are inclined to the supposition that Lv. prescribes the general rule which is superseded in the law of Dt. by the exceptional circumstances there contemplated. The latter view--probably harmonistic--is also advanced by tradition. 'The nakedness of thy brother's wife' thou shalt not uncover' (Lv.1916) and the law 'her husband's brother shall take her to him to wife' (Dt.255) were both said in one articulation. (cf. Siphre 232  $\text{כִּי תִּשְׁמַע$ ; Cant. r. sec. 28;  $\text{פְּרָשׁוֹת נֶדְרִים}$  37 d. (13 from below); p. Shebuoth 34 d. (25-6 from below). In Lv.4 those who may bring offerings for unintentional offenses are divided into four classes, the anointed priest (43), the whole congregation (413), the ruler (422), and one of the common people (427). The offering in the last case is a she-goat (428) or a lamb (432). In Nm.15 those who sin unwittingly are divided into only two classes; the whole congregation (1524), and one of the common people (1527). The regulation here in the last case provides a she-goat for the offering 1527, but no lamb as in (Lv.432) is mentioned. The main contradiction, however, lies in this that in (Lv.414) the offering for the whole congregation is described as a 'young bullock for a sin-offering' while in (Nm.1524) it is a young bullock as a burnt offering and one he-goat for a sin offering. This difficulty was removed in the Mishnaic Talmudic literature by referring the sin offering mentioned in Nm. to idolatry. (cf. Siphre 112  $\text{נִשְׁחָט}$ , Horayot 7,9.)

Lev.171-7 requires every ox, lamb or goat slain for food



by the Israelites to be presented at the sanctuary; Dt. 12<sup>15</sup> says that the Israelite may kill and eat flesh within all his gates after all the desire of his soul. The law in Dt. presupposes one central place of worship; the law in Lv. is in conformity to the prevailing custom of a multiplicity of local shrines (so acc. to Driver).

According to R. Akiba there is no reference to profane slaughtering in Lv. 17. The law there simply prohibits the offering of sacrifices outside the Tabernacle. (Hullin 16b. 17a. Siphre 75 דָּרַךְ )

*while acc. to R. Ishmael the law in Lv prohibiting profane slaughtering is intended only for the wilderness; while the Dt. provision looks forward to Jewish settlement in Canaan. The difficulty is*

~~Another way of removing the discrepancy was to interpret~~  
Dt. 12<sup>8</sup> as follows: Do not when you enter Canaan i.e. during the fourteen years of the conquest when you are permitted to offer on high places and on local shrines, as we do today, when we have centralization and consequently may offer both voluntary and obligatory offerings. But then each may offer only what is ( וְשֵׁר בְּעֵינָיו ) proper in his eyes. (Siphre 68 דָּרַךְ Zebahim 117b.)

According to Dt. 15<sup>20</sup> the firstlings are to be presented every year at the sanctuary. Ex. 22<sup>29</sup> commands that they be given to God on the eighth day. The latter passage (E) evidently presupposes the time of the plurality of sanctuaries.

Tradition asserts that Ex. 22<sup>29</sup> means that the firstlings are to be presented from the eighth day and onward. (Mekilata p. 104 Siphre 8 אָטוֹר ).

According to Lv. 27<sup>27</sup> if the firstling be an unclean animal, it is to be redeemed in money, adding one-fifth of the net value. In Ex. 13<sup>13</sup> the firstling of an ass is redeemed by a lamb.

The answer given is that by 'the ass' mentioned in Ex. is meant the individual and not the kind or type of unclean beasts. (cf. Mekilata p. 103 ). And the reason why the law thus distinguishes the ass from the general run of unclean animals is because they were of such assistance to Israel at the Exodus. 'Not one Israelite who had not ninety Libyan asses laden with the gold and silver of Egypt.' (Bekorot 5b.)

X. RABBINICAL HARMONIES WERE NOT RESTRICTED TO THE FEW CANONS OF INTERPRETATION CONSIDERED ABOVE. THE FOLLOWING CASES INDICATE THAT OTHER METHODS WERE OFTEN RESORTED TO.

Thus the difficulty with the polyonymous Jethro (cf. above p. 17 ) is removed by asserting that he was blessed with seven names. (Mekilata sec. פָּאָן גְּמִילָק Midw. Tanhuma יִתְרוֹ ). Or again, it is said that Pe'uel is a term of endearment, just as little children call grandpa, --pa. (Cant. r. § 1 and 27 Siphre 78 בְּהִילָתָן ).

*was the name of Jethro's father and that 'their father'*  
Ex 3<sup>8</sup>

To the question as to whether the Exodus took place at day or in the night (cf. above p. 18 ) the rabbis answer that the redemption took place at night but the Exodus in the morning וְכִי בַלֵּילָה יֵצְאוּ וְהַלֵּא לֹא יֵצְאוּ אֶלֶּא בַּיּוֹם שְׁנֵאמַר מִמֶּנּוּ אֶלֶּא מִלְמַד שֶׁנִּגְאָלוּ בַּלֵּילָה Siphre § 128. Other-wise in Berq<sup>a</sup>: מִלְמַד שֶׁהִתְחִילָה לֵהֵם גְּאוּלָּה מִבְּעָרָב.

Ex. 6<sup>2</sup> reads: 'I am Yahwe, and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob, as God Almighty, but by my name Yahwe I was not known unto them.' The difficulty here is that throughout Genesis the patriarchs are constantly using the name Yahwe. (Gn. 15<sup>8</sup>, 24<sup>28</sup>, 4<sup>26</sup>).

The rabbinical solution is as follows: Moses complains (5<sup>23</sup>) that in spite of his message to Pharaoh the latter continued in his oppressive policy. This lack of faith on the part of Moses recalls to Yahwe's mind the piety of the forefathers. Woe for those that are gone and are no more. Many a time did I reveal myself to them as El Šaddai; many a time did it seem to them that my promise to give them the land where they were sojourning was not to be fulfilled. (Abraham had to buy a burial-place for his wife, Isaac had his wells stopped by the Philistines, Jacob had to buy a place where to pitch his tent), and yet they never showed their dissatisfaction with my methods ( מַדּוּת ) by asking me: What is thy name? (Šnh 111<sup>a</sup>).

According to Ex. 19<sup>25</sup> Moses went down from the mountain to the people. In 20<sup>21</sup> he ascends again. We are hardly prepared then in 24<sup>1</sup> to find him commanded to come up, when he is already there. The solution of some rabbinical scholars is that 24<sup>1</sup> was commanded to Moses on the 4th day of Siwan just as 19<sup>11</sup> and 19<sup>24</sup>. Then what is told in 24<sup>3-8</sup> took place on the 5th day preparatory to the theophany of the following day. On this day Moses builds the altar and writes the Book of Covenant, containing Gn. 1--Ex. 19, and reads it to the people. The principle involved in this interpretation is obviously מִן מוֹקְדִים וּמֵאוּחָר R. Jose, son of R. Jehuda, urges on the other hand, that the present order of the narrative is to be maintained. Thus according to him 24<sup>1-8</sup> records the events of the sixth day, after the theophany. The difficulty in Ex. 6 is left to take care of itself. (cf. Mekilata 72). || In Ex. 16<sup>29</sup> the law of the Sabbath is presupposed; in Ex. 18 likewise the law concerning the appointment of judges. Hence the rabbis pointing to Ex. 15b. 'There he made for them a statute and an ordinance' are constrained to remark that at Mara part of the law was given,--according to R. Joshua the law of the Sabbath, Honoring of Parents, and Judges; according to the Talmud, Sabbath, Civil and Criminal Law and Respect of Parents. (cf. Sanhedrin 56b. Mekilata 54).

Even such slight phenomena as redactional omissions are

noticed by the rabbis. Thus in Ex.4<sup>14</sup> after 'the anger of the Lord was kindled against Moses' we do not expect the interview to close with the honor conferred in ~~416~~. We expect rather something like the utterance repeatedly referred to in Dt. that Yahwe sware in anger, Thou shalt indeed bring up this people unto the land which I give them, but thou thyself shalt not go in thither, etc. (Dt.34<sup>4</sup>, 42<sup>1</sup>, 31<sup>3</sup>).

The omission is accounted for in Mishnic Talmudic literature as follows: R.Joshua b.Kor~~cha~~ says: Every time 'the wrath of God' is mentioned in the Tora, the punishment (כּוּסָם) is indicated together with it. Here no such effect is mentioned. R. Simeon b.Jo~~chai~~ says: Even here the כּוּסָם is stated. Ex.4<sup>14</sup> says: 'Is there not Aaron thy brother, the Levite? But we know that Aaron was a priest. This then is the meaning. I said that thou wast <sup>to</sup> a <sup>bc</sup> priest, and Aaron a Levite, now I say, that Aaron is a priest and thou art a Levite.' On this interpretation, [אָהֲרֹן אֶחָיו] הָלִי, is equivalent to שֶׁהִיא רְאוּיָה לְהִיּוֹת לִי and the other difficulty is solved at the same time (Zebahim 102 b).

CHAPTER III.

RATIONALISM.

MEDIEVAL JEWISH EXEGESIS.            PHASES OF HARMONISTIC  
INTERPRETATIONS AS ILLUSTRATED BY RASHI, IBN EZRA,  
NAHMANI.            THEIR RELATION TO TRADITIONALISM.            NEW  
CANONS OF HARMONISTIC EXEGESIS.

I. IN THE TRADITIONAL LITERATURE ITSELF THERE RUNS A VEIN OF RATIONALISM. OVER AGAINST THE TWISTED INTERPRETATION AND 'APPLIED' EXEGESIS OF SCRIPTURE ON WHICH THE TALMUDIC-MIDRASHIC STRUCTURE IS REARED, WE FIND PRINCIPLES SUBVERSIVE OF TRADITIONAL HERMENEUTICS REPRESENTING THE GERMS OF RATIONALISM. THUS R. AKIBA'S FORCED HERMENEUSIS (MIELZ. p.125) WAS OPPOSED BY R. ISHMAEL ( דבריה תורה אין מקרא כלשון בני אדם ). OF STILL MORE IMPORTANCE IS THE PRINCIPLE ( 'שא מיד' פשוט ) 'THE RATIONAL SENSE OF A SCRIPTURAL PASSAGE MUST NEVER BE ABANDONED' (Sabb.63a. Yeb|11b, 24a. quoted by MIELZ. p.122 foot-note 2.) IT IMPLIES A FULL CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE RATIONAL SENSE AS OPPOSED TO THE APPLIED-HALAKHIC AND HAGGADIC-- RABBINICAL INTERPRETATION. IT AFFORDED THE MEDIEVAL JEWISH EXEGETES AN EXCUSE FOR THEIR OPPOSITION TO THE MIDRASH AND THEIR RETURN(?) TO THE RATIONAL MEANING OF SCRIPTURE. THE RATIONAL SENSE WAS NOW RATHER SLOWLY DEVELOPED.

II. AS REPRESENTATIVES OF THE RATIONAL INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE AMONG THE JEWISH EXEGETES OF POST-TALMUDIC TIMES WE MAY MENTION RASHI, (S), IBN EZRA, (IE), AND NAHMANI, (N), AS STANDING FOR THREE DISTINCT STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF RATIONALISM. FOR A COMPREHENSIVE KNOWLEDGE OF THE WHOLE MOVEMENT TO STUDY ONLY THESE THREE EXEGETES IS FAR FROM ADEQUATE; BUT FOR OUR PRESENT PURPOSE, VIZ. TO GET A PICTURE OF RATIONALISM IN BROAD OUTLINE THESE WILL SUFFICE, ESPECIALLY AS IN THEM WE FIND THE VIEWS OF THE OLDER EXEGETES OFTIMES QUOTED.

Rashi = R. Solomon, son of Isaac, of Troyes, France died 1105. Ibn Ezra = Abraham ben Meir ibn Ezra of Toledo,

Spain died 1167. Nahmani = Moses ben Nahmani of Gerona, Spain died about 1270.

III. RASHI IS YET LARGELY A TRADITIONALIST. BUT HIS FEW DEVIATIONS FROM THE METHODS OF THE OLD SCHOOL ARE NOTEWORTHY BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT, AS ONE MIGHT EXPECT OF A MAN WHO FOLLOWS HIS MASTERS SO CLOSELY, FURTIVE OR ACCIDENTAL BUT QUITE TO THE CONTRARY CONSCIOUS AND ON PRINCIPLE. EXAMPLES OF THIS CONSCIOUS DEVIATION WILL BE AFFORDED LATER ON. IT IS ENOUGH TO STATE HERE THAT R. SAMUEL b. MEIR רשב"ם (d.1158) HIS GRANDSON AND DISCIPLE NOTES THE SAME FACT. HE SAYS IN EFFECT THAT ALTHOUGH THE PRINCIPLE אין מקרא יוצא מיד פשוט WAS WELL KNOWN THROUGHOUT ALL JEWISH LITERATURE, THE SAGES OF OLD IN THEIR GREAT PIETY ALWAYS SOUGHT TO INTERPRET SCRIPTURE ON THE BASIS OF דרש AS OVER AGAINST פשוט. BUT, HIS GRANDFATHER RASHI HAS ALWAYS TAUGHT HIM AT LEAST TO DEVOTE HIS ATTENTION TO THE RATIONAL MEANING OF THE TEXT; AND HE GOES ON TO SAY THAT IN A CONVERSATION WHICH HE ONCE HAD WITH HIM RASHI ASSURED HIM THAT IF HE HAD THE TIME HE WOULD REWRITE HIS COMMENTARY IN TOUCH WITH THE NEW RATIONAL INTERPRETATIONS WHICH WERE COMING DAILY TO THE FRONT. (לפי

זוהו הפשוט המתחדשים בכל יום). cf רשב"ם ad Gn 37<sup>2</sup>, ed. Rosin p. 49.

IV. THE FOLLOWING INSTANCES INDICATE HOW NAIVELY RASHI BORROWS HARMONIES FROM THE TRADITIONAL LITERATURE.

Boiling or roasting of the passover. (Cf. S ad. Dt.16 and above ). 2. The flesh of the carcass ( ) (S ad.Dt.14 and above ) 3. Firstlings (Cf.S ad.Dt.15 , Ex.22 and above ) 4. Paschal offering. (Cf.S ad.Dt. 16 and above ). 5. Tithes. (Cf.S ad.Dt.14 and above ). Note על כרתך 'you have to admit' i.e. from the point of view of the unity of the Pentateuch). 6. Hebrew Slaves. (Cf.S ad.Dt.15 Ex.21 and above ). 7. Eternal Servitude (Cf.S ad.pt.15 Ex.21 and above ). 8. The Exodus at day or night, (Cf,S ad,Ex,12 and above ).

V. RASHI'S INDEBTEDNESS TO TRADITIONALISM IS SHOWN ALSO BY HIS FREQUENT USE OF THE OLD HARMONISTIC CANONS.

For example he applies the thirteenth principle of R. Eliezer ( כלל שלאחריו מעשה הוא פרטו של ראשון ) to the second account of creation. (Cf.S ad.Gn.2<sup>8</sup> and above ).

Again Ex.4<sup>20a</sup> (J) reads 'and Moses took his wife and his sons and set them upon an ass and he returned to the land of Egypt.'; Ex.4<sup>20b</sup> (E- to be understood in connection with 3<sup>20</sup> and 4<sup>17</sup>) reads: 'and Moses took the rod of God in his hand' If we combine 4<sup>20b</sup> with 4<sup>20a</sup> we have a syntactical difficulty which makes it impossible to take the second part of the verse with its first half. The Redactor in dove-tailing the documents destroyed the sequence. S explains away the incongruity by the principle אין מקדמו ואחר מדיקיקים במקרא 'There is no exact chronological sequence in Scripture.' (Cf.S ad.Ex.4<sup>20</sup> and above ).

VI. STILL SOME OF RASHI'S HARMONISTIC INTERPRETATIONS ARE QUITE NEW AND ORIGINAL WITH HIM. AT LEAST THEIR CONNECTION WITH THE OLD MIDRASHIC SOURCES CANNOT NOW BE TRACED.

Thus Nm. 10<sup>12</sup>(P) contains the summary account of the departure from Sinai and the arrival at the wilderness of Paran. But in Nm.11<sup>3</sup> (E) we are at Tab'era, 11<sup>34</sup>(J) at Qibrot Hatta'awa, 11<sup>35</sup> (J) at Hazerot, and finally 12<sup>16</sup> in the wilderness of Paran. (Since Qadeš and not 'the wilderness of Paran' is the scene of the following event in Nm.13<sup>1b</sup>, possibly the phrase here is a harmonistic alteration by R<sup>e</sup> for the original Qadeš J.) At all events as the text now stands according to 10<sup>12</sup> 'The wilderness of Paran' is the first station after Sinai, in 12<sup>16</sup> it is the fifth. S (ad.10<sup>12</sup>) declares that 'The wilderness of Paran' in 10<sup>12</sup> means Qibrot Hatta'awa, the first settlement in it. (cf.Nm.33). The harmony here is based on the familiar recourse of the traditionalists, that of the identification (sometimes dissociation) of proper names. (cf. above ).

Again Ex.16<sup>16a</sup> (E) Yahwe commands the Israelites to gather the manna 'every man according to his eating' i.e. various amounts; Ex.16<sup>16b</sup>(P) they are asked to gather 'an omer a head' i.e. each the same amount. The next verse Ex.16<sup>17</sup> reads: 'And the children of Israel did so, and gathered some more, some less. And when they did mete it out with an omer, he that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack; they gathered every man according to his eating.' This verse with its 'miraculous adjustment' of the amount is evidently a harmonistic insertion of R. intending to explain how it could be true that 'they gathered it every man

according to his eating! (E) and at the same time that they gathered 'an omer a head.' (P) (Cf. Bacon, T.T.E.p.90). S perceived the incongruity of 16<sup>b</sup> and simply unfolds the implied redactional harmony. 'According to the number of souls in your tents ( כפי מנין נפשותישי לאיש באהל ) shall you take an omer for each person.' As for the 'miraculous adjustment of the amount' (harmonistic) he explicitly notes ( והו נס גדול שנקשה בו ) 'and this is a great miracle which the Lord wrought for them.'

In Nm. 24<sup>5</sup>(J) we are informed that Balaam after delivering his famous oracle returned to his place which from 22<sup>5</sup> we know is the city of Pethor on the Euphrates. We are greatly surprised therefore to find him in Nm.31<sup>8</sup>(P) counted among the slain of the Midianites. S readily accounts for Balaam's mysterious and at the same time fatal presence in Midian. Before Balaam left for the Euphrates he gave the Midianites the benefit of his wise counsels concerning Baal Pe'or. Hearing of the good results obtained by acting out his advise Balaam returns to the Midianites to receive his reward. Thus he is found there and killed. (Cf. S ad. Nm. 31<sup>8</sup>). This is almost a picture of traditional harmonizing.

VII. RASHI DOES NOT ENTIRELY REPRODUCE THE MIDRASHIC SOURCES. HE OFTEN MERELY ADOPTS THE ESSENTIAL POINTS OF THE MIDRASHIC EXPLANATION OMITTING ITS HAGGADIC FEATURES.

Thus there is another difficulty in Ex.4<sup>20,21</sup> besides the one mentioned above § 5. This arises when we come to regard 4<sup>20,21</sup>(E) as the sequel of 4<sup>1-9</sup>(J). The wonders in the last section viz. the magic rod, (4<sup>2</sup>) the leprous hand (4<sup>b</sup>) and the conversion of water to blood(4<sup>9</sup>), were meant for the children of Israel, while in (4<sup>21</sup>) Yahwe commands Moses to do 'all the wonders which I have put in thine hands' before Pharaoh. The Midrash (Mid.r.quoted by N.ad. loc.) notices this 'non sequitur.' It asks 'To what 'wonders' does Ex.4<sup>21</sup> refer? It cannot refer to the three mentioned in 4<sup>1-9</sup> for these were to be done before Israel. And we know in fact that they were not done in the presence of Pharaoh. Hence what can the phrase 'All the wonders which I have put into thy hand' mean? The solution is that on the staff which Moses took in his hand (Ex.4<sup>20b</sup>) was written 'per notaricon' שְׁנֵי עָשָׂר ( a phrase made up out of the first letters of the names of the ten plagues) S (ad.4<sup>21</sup>) adopts the Midrashic exegesis, omitting only the haggadic feature (the notaricon on the rod) and adding this linguistic explanation, 'See that thou do before Pharaoh all the wonders which I will put in thine hand (MT. תַּעֲשֶׂה=perf. I have put rendered fut. I will put- which is possible.)



VIII. WE HAVE SAID THAT RASHI WAS SIGNIFICANT FOR HIS CONSCIOUS DEVIATION FROM TRADITIONALISM. WE ARE NOW TO REGARD HIM AS PLACING THE ENTIRE EMPHASIS ON THE RATIONAL INTERPRETATION.

Thus the supposed incongruity between Gn.1<sup>27</sup> 'Male and Female created he them' and Gn.2<sup>11-24</sup> where man is created first and woman after he harmonizes by quoting the traditional interpretation 'The protoplast was a hermaphrodite' (Cf. above ) but adding that according to the rational explanation ( פשוטו של מקרא ) the first text simply states the fact of their being created while the second narrates the manner and order of their creation. (Cf. S ad.Gn.1<sup>27</sup>).

Again in that highly complex narrative of the revolt of Qorah and Dathan and Abiram, Moses after the insurrection of the latter became very wroth and said unto Yahwe 'Respect not their offering.' (Nm.16<sup>15</sup> J) when unfortunately the redactor omitted to tell us anything about their offering, after that part of J's account preparing us for Moses' prayer had been suppressed. The problem then is to explain Nm.16<sup>15</sup>. S (ad.loc.) says that according to tradition their share in the customary daily offering ( תמידי ) of the people shall not be consumed by fire but shall be let alone unfavored. But according to the rational interpretation ( לפי פשוטו ) 'their offering' means the incense mentioned in 16<sup>15</sup>.

In Ex.6<sup>2</sup>(P) Yahwe reveals himself to Moses and discloses that by his name Yahwe he was never known before even to the patriarchs which contradicts the statements of Gn.15<sup>2</sup> 24<sup>28</sup> 4<sup>26</sup> and passim. The Midrashic explanation has already been unfolded. (Cf.above ). S asserts that it is not acceptable for the following reasons:

- (a) It is not said here: ושמתי יהוה לא שאלו לי.
- (b) God did reveal himself as Yahwe to the forefathers.
- (c) On the traditional assumption how is 6<sup>2</sup> to be explained? S therefore drops the traditional explanation.

( לקד אני אומר יתישב המקרא על פשוטו דבר דבור על אפני והורשה תירש )  
 a quoting Jr.23 and pointing to the doctrine of the polyphonus character of Scripture deduced therefrom. Cf.Synh. 34b) The rational explanation ( פשוט ) of S in this case is according to his own statement almost the same given him by רבי ברוך ברבי אליעזר . The features are: 'I am Yahwe' ( אני יהוה ) Ex.6<sup>2</sup> means 'I am faithful to reward those who walk in my ways' ( נאמן לשלם שכר טוב לכותביכם לפני ); 'And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob as El Shaddai' means 'I made them promises' ( הבטחתם הבטחות ); But by my name Yahwe I was not known to them ( ושמתי יהוה לא ) should be rendered But by my name Yahwe I did not make myself known to them, meaning to say I was not recognized by them in my essential attributes on account of

which I am called Yahwe, (i.e. my faithfulness to fulfill my word)-inasmuch as I made promises to them which I did not fulfill.' (לא הודעתו אין כתיב כאן, אלא לא הודעתו, לא נברתי להם) ×  
 במדת אמונות שלי שעליה נקרא שמי יהוה נאמן לאמת דברי שררי  
 (הבטחותם ולא קיימתי).

IX. OF THE THREE JEWISH MEDIEVAL EXEGETES TO WHOM OUR ATTENTION IS MAINLY DEVOTED IN THIS SKETCH, IBN EZRA IS BY FAR THE MOST KNOWN. IN THE INTRODUCTORY LITERATURE HE IS MENTIONED AMONG THE 'PRECURSORS OF CRITICISM'. HIS CRITICAL 'DOUBTS AND HERESIES' (Cf. HOLZ. p.29) IT IS STRANGE TO SAY, TOUCH VERY LITTLE THE GROUND OF THIS THESIS. THEY CONCERN ONLY THE SO-CALLED ANACHRONISMS OF THE PENTATEUCH. IBN EZRA'S ATTITUDE AS A HARMONIST IS LESS KNOWN. IT IS IMPORTANT TO OBSERVE AT THE VERY OUTSET THAT HE, TOO, THOUGH LESS OFTEN THAN RASHI, STILL ON SOME NOTE-WORTHY OCCASIONS, NAIVELY FOLLOWS TRADITION.

For example noting the difficulty as to what really constitutes the Paschal offering, whether it is 'sheep and oxen' or only 'a lamb' (Cf. above ) he states the traditional answer in terms which do not indicate his dissent, adding however his own explanation that while in Egypt the Israelites were permitted to slaughter sheep for the Paschal sacrifice, now they were permitted to slaughter cattle also if they could afford it. But after all he finds the traditional explanation the better one. (Cf. IE. ad. Dt.16<sup>2</sup>).

And similarly of the old problem of the eternal servitude of the voluntary slave (Cf. above ) IE. agrees with tradition that לְקוּלָּהּ = יוֹבֵל (Cf. IE. ad. Ex.21<sup>b</sup>).

Again, IE. assumes that the permission granted to the 'stranger' to eat the carcass of any animal dying by itself ( נֹבֵלָה ) in Dt.14<sup>21</sup> refers only to strangers who do not profess Judaism. This was also the way in which tradition harmonized D with P which forbade the carcass to the stranger (Cf. above ) (IE. ad. Dt.14<sup>21</sup>).

To harmonize Dt.16<sup>7</sup> which says that the paschal offering is to be boiled ( בָּשָׁל ) with Ex.12<sup>b</sup> which says that it is to be roasted ( שָׁלַח אֵשׁ ) he interprets בָּשָׁל with tradition to mean בָּשָׁל בְּאֵשׁ i.e. to roast and he quotes in support of the theory the verse in II Chr.35<sup>13</sup> וַיִּבְטְלוּ הַפֶּסַח בְּאֵשׁ . (Cf. above ) (IE ad. Dt.16<sup>7</sup>).

Again, according to Nm.18<sup>15-16</sup> the firstlings are assigned to the priest. When Dt.15<sup>20</sup> therefore says 'Thou shalt eat it (the firstlings) before the Lord..... in the place which the Lord shall choose', the word Thou is a stumbling-block in the way of the earliest practice (Cf. above ) which was based on P to the exclusion of D. The difficulty is removed by IE.<sup>2</sup> interpreting 'Thou' as meaning not the owner but as 'thou who art fit to eat it' ( מִי שֶׁהוּא רִאשׁוֹן לְאָכְלוֹ ) i.e. the priest. Therefore, '(thou and thy household' = the priest's household. (Cf. below § X). (IE.ad. Dt.15<sup>20</sup>)

X. WHILE THUS IBN EZRA APPARENTLY GOES WITH TRADITION IN SOME VERY IMPORTANT INSTANCES, HIS ANTAGONISM TO THE MIDRASH, WHETHER EXPRESSED IN SO MANY WORDS OR SIMPLY HINTED AT IN VEILED SPEECH AND IN A MANNER CHARACTERISTIC OF THIS SCHOLAR, IS MORE CONSPICUOUS THAN IN THE CASE OF THE TIMID RASHI. THIS OPPOSITION MAKES HIM PECULIARLY SENSITIVE TO DIFFICULTIES, WHERE HIS PREDECESSORS ARE SILENT.

It is hardly necessary to corroborate the first statement of the paragraph by references to his commentary. This aspect of Ibn Ezra's exegetical work is so notorious that it really constitutes the chief characteristic by which he is most commonly known. Cf. his Introduction to his Pentateuch commentary (ed. Rosin p.35ff.) where he outlines the exegetical methods of his predecessors and contemporaries, alluding in § 4 to the exegetical methods current in the Graeco-Roman countries consisting in adhering faithfully to the haggadic side of the Midrash. He recalls the Rabbinical principle that 'the rational sense of Scripture must be allowed to stand', and the other principle that 'the Tora presents seventy phases'. Still in halakhic matters he wished always to be understood as on the side of tradition, to avoid being classed together with the Karaites. Rosin in his valuable note (5) on p.48 informs us that the North-French exegetes of of Rashi's school, whose most conspicuous representative was Samuel ben Meir, very often contradict the halakha with an astounding innocence, while Ibn Ezra, even where he cannot refrain from recording a deviating explanation, seeks to assure his readers of his deference to the halakha which, he maintains, remains in full force though the exegesis on which it is based be abandoned, at times endeavoring to reconcile it

with his own view. At best this method shows only the vacillating character of a man who is either afraid or else is unable to break entirely with tradition. Cf. the examples above IX.

IE's keen appreciation of incongruities is evidenced by the following examples. Ex.16<sup>6</sup> Moses and Aaron deliver to the people this message from Yahwe: 'You shall see the glory of the Lord. The Lord heareth your murmurings. The Lord shall give you in the evening flesh to eat, and in the morning bread to the full.' Afterwards vv.11f. Moses receives the message he has just communicated, the terms being identical.'And Yahwe spake unto Moses saying: I have heard the murmurings of Israel. Say unto them, 'At even ye shall eat flesh and in the morning ye shall be filled with bread'.' IE. (ad.Ex.16") says that Yahwe repeats in vv.11-12 what Moses had already said in vv.6-8 in order that Israel might see the glory of the Lord as promised them in v,7 and executed in v,10 ( וַיֵּרָא הַגְּבוּרָה וַיִּשְׂמְרוּ אֶת-עַמּוּד הַשָּׁמַיִם וַיִּשְׂמְרוּ אֶת-עַמּוּד הַשָּׁמַיִם )

In the above passage before Yahwe gives to Moses the message which he has already delivered, Moses bids Aaron say unto all the congregation of Israel vv.9-10; 'Come near before Yahwe, for he hath heard your murmurings. And it came to pass as Aaron spake to the whole congregation of Israel that they look toward the wilderness and behold the glory of Yahwe appeared in the cloud.' Now that Israel looked toward the wilderness ( מִדְבָּר ) is impossible since they were already encamped in the midst of the wilderness. Bacon (p.89) has shown that the reading מִדְבָּר is a redactional change for מִטַּבֵּיחַ tabernacle, the regular place for the appearance of the Shekinah. IE (ad.Ex.16<sup>9</sup>) says that 'Come before Yahwe' means 'Come to the wilderness' ( אֶל הַמִּדְבָּר ) which from his point of view is justified by v,10,-and thus IE in explicit terms explains the implied redactional change of מִדְבָּר to מִטַּבֵּיחַ. Thus the phrase 'before Yahwe' over which many a reader slurs with the least thought as to its proper signification brought out so clearly by modern exegesis (criticism) is understood by IE. (It is interesting to note that in Ex.16<sup>33</sup> where the same phrase occurs 'Lay it before Yahwe' S even feels that it must refer to the tabernacle (but note the help afforded here by the context). And in order to explain away the anachronism S is forced to assume that this verse was added here later on after the construction of the tabernacle. לִפְנֵי יְהוָה = לִפְנֵי הָאֵרֶן לֹא נִבְנָה אֶת-הָאֵרֶן עַד שֶׁבִּנְיָה אֶת-הַמִּוֶּעֵד. IE on the other hand has no solution to offer):

The interchange of the divine names becomes especially conspicuous in cases where the welding together of J and E makes of the narrative a mere mosaic. Thus Ex.3<sup>4</sup> 'And when Yahwe saw that he turned aside to see, Elohim called unto him out of the midst of the bush' arrests the attention of Ibn Ezra. He identifies Elohim with the 'messenger of Yahwe' of v,2. Yahwe steps aside merely to look on, and he

directs the messenger to speak with Moses. Hence it becomes necessary in v,7 where Yahwe speaks, for IE to explain that 'the messenger speaks in the name of his sender' (השליח ידבר בלשון שולחו) (Cf. IE. ad. 3<sup>1</sup>.1) (Cf. also IE's observations on the change of the divine names in the first chapters of Genesis ad. Gn. 2<sup>12</sup>, Ex. 4<sup>13</sup> ).

In Nm. 11<sup>25</sup> it is said that Eldad and Medad had not gone out unto the Tent; again, in Nm. 12<sup>1</sup> Moses and Aaron and Miriam are bidden to go out unto the Tent of meeting. This is in conformity with the view of E according to whom the tabernacle stood outside the camp (Cf. above ). IE notices the difficulty and interprets 11<sup>25</sup> to mean that Eldad and Medad had not gone out from the camp of Israel to the tabernacle. In the second case 'Come ye out.....and they came out' means according to IE that each came out from his tent.

XI. IBN EZRA'S OPPOSITION TO THE HAGGADA MAKES HIM THE TRUE REPRESENTATIVE OF RATIONALISM PURE AND SIMPLE. WE OFTEN FEEL THAT WE ARE SAFER IN THE COMPANY OF THE TRADITIONALISTS AND THEIR NAIVE FOLLOWERS THAN UNDER THE GUIDANCE OF THE EXEGETE WHO AIMS AT DOING JUSTICE TO 'THE LAWS OF LANGUAGE AND COMMON SENSE'.

Thus IE explains how it could be possible that Israel gathered the manna, 'every man according to his eating' and at the same time 'an omer a head'. According to the rational interpretation (בדרך הטבריא) an omer for each soul refers to the adults. Minors were to take just the amount they needed. Again על דרך הפשט each household-- no matter how many persons it contained-- found that it had gathered the same amount exactly when measured in omers, he adds ironically: וקדמוני אמרו כי הוא דבר פלא. 'Our Rabbis say that it is a miracle'. Despite IE's irony the קדמונים are truer to the history than the rationalist.

XII. IN THE GREATER NUMBER OF CASES IBN EZRA'S INDEPENDENT POSITION AS A HARMONIST IS BITTERLY DISAPPOINTING. THE 'LAWS OF LANGUAGE' ARE CRUELLY ILL-TREATED. A SYNTACTICAL RULE RUNNING COUNTER TO THE COMMON FACTS OF HEBREW CONSTRUCTION IS MANUFACTURED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING DIFFICULTIES HAVING THEIR ORIGIN IN THE STRUCTURAL CHARACTER OF THE BOOK. WORDS ARE TWISTED OUT OF THEIR MEANING, SEQUENCE DISREGARDED, AND THE MUCH-VAUNTED 'COMMON -

THAT IBN EZRA IS NOT EARNEST ENOUGH IN HIS ENDEAVOR TO RECONCILE CON-  
 TRADICTIONS OR TO EXPLAIN INCONGRUITIES. HENCE HIS FLIPPANT SUPER-  
 FICIALITY, HIS EASY-GOING WAYS; HENCE IT IS ALMOST ALWAYS THE LEAST  
 PLAUSIBLE ANSWER THAT GOES BY HIS NAME. WE FEEL AT TIMES THAT EITHER  
 IBN EZRA WAS DELUDED HIMSELF, OR ELSE THAT HE IS CONSTANTLY AND PUR-  
 POSELY DELUDING US. WITH IBN EZRA THE TRADITIONAL POINT OF VIEW IS  
 SORELY REDUCED AD ABSURDUM. AND WERE INDEED HIS ANSWERS THE ONLY  
 ONES THAT HAVE BEEN PROPOUNDED IN THE HISTORY OF HARMONISTIC EXEGESIS  
 CRITICISM WOULD FEEL THAT IT IS BUILT UPON TOTTERING FOUNDATIONS, --  
 BECAUSE THE TRANSITION FROM TRADITIONALISM IS MADE TOO EASY.

Nothing illustrates IE's superficiality better than the device he frequently employs for harmonistic purposes of translating an imperfect cum waw consecutivo by the plu-perfect. Thus in Ex.19 Moses ascends the mountain (v,3a) but in the next half of the verse he is supposed to be below again. (Bacon p.101 n. assumes a displacement of 3b-8]. The verse reads 'and Moses went up unto God--and Yahwe called unto him out of the mountain,etc.' implying that Moses was below. IE's expedient for the removal of the incongruity is to render 'and Yahwe called' ( ויקרא ) by 'but Yahwe had called unto him out of the mountain.' ( ויברר קרא ) It follows from this interpretation that Moses really remained on the mountain and thus another difficulty arises. For v,7 says 'Moses came and told' (not came down and told, as in vv,14,25,etc.) implying that Moses was not on the mountain at all when Yahwe spoke. IE consistently takes v,7 'Moses came' ( ויבא ) to mean 'Moses came down' ( וירד ) adding that it was not necessary to state that he came down in so many words. Again Ex.4<sup>18</sup> (E) reads: 'And Moses returned to his father-in-law Jethro and said: 'Let me return to Egypt.' And Jethro said: 'Go in peace.' The next verse 19 (J) reads: 'And the Lord said unto Moses in Midian, 'Go, return to Egypt.' v,19 is alternative to v,18 and cannot be the sequel of it. IE says that v,19 is anterior to v,18 by the principle--- אין סוקדים ומאחר בתורה (Ibn Ezra's principle is indeed an extension of the Rabbinical principle of the absence of chronological order in the Tora. But we have to remember (Cf.above ) how the Rabbis were

careful to limit the principle to larger sections, maintaining the existence of order and proper sequence within one and the same section. But to extend the principle with IE means to introduce anarchy in the domain of the Tora, and undermine traditionalism with weapons forged by the Rabbis.) IE says further the phrase 'and the Lord said' ( וַיֹּאמֶר ) is to be rendered 'and the Lord had already said' ( וַיִּכְבֵּל אָמַר ). For further examples Cf. Gn. 1<sup>9</sup> 2<sup>5</sup>, 12<sup>1</sup>, 24<sup>6+</sup>, 35<sup>14</sup>; Ex. 4<sup>1</sup>, 16<sup>15</sup>, 19<sup>1</sup>; Nm. 16<sup>10</sup>, etc. Cf. also Driver's instructive note, Tenses 3<sup>ed</sup>, p.84ff.

The following examples will serve to illustrate IE's Easy-going methods in dealing with structural difficulties.

Although from Ex. 9<sup>b</sup> we know that all the cattle of Egypt are dead, not one solitary beast having survived the plague of murrain, we are informed in 9<sup>19-21. 22. 25<sup>a</sup></sup> that the plague of the hail is especially directed against the cattle and the beasts of the field. IE in order to remove the discrepancy twists words out of their natural meaning. He asserts (ad.Ex.9<sup>b</sup>) that כל חקיה does not mean all the cattle; only the greater part ( רובו ) succumbed to the murrain, the rest were victims of the hail.

IE is extremely facile. He always chooses the easiest way out of a difficulty. Thus in Ex.17<sup>1</sup> Joshua ( יְהוֹשֻׁעַ ) is introduced although he is never known by that name until Nm.10<sup>6</sup> having been previously called Hoshea ( הוֹשֵׁעַ ). IE simply says that he is called Joshua in Ex.17<sup>1</sup> by anticipation.

IE makes frequent use of the principle of identification or dissociation. Thus the parallel accounts of the naming of Beersheba are noted. He says (ad. Gn.26<sup>33</sup>) that either Beersheba was named twice or that they are different localities. ( באר שבע-נקרא בן על שני דברים או היא עיר אחת ). (Cf. IE ad.Gn.37<sup>38</sup>, 47<sup>1</sup>). Further examples will be found below.

XIII. IN OPPOSITION TO IBN EZRA'S EASY METHODS AND ILL-CONCEALED SCEPTICISM WE FIND IN NAHMANI THE CONSCIOUS APOLOGETE AND RATIONAL CHAMPION OF TRADITIONALISM. A YOUNGER CONTEMPORARY OF DAVID KIMHI, HE TOOK A CONSPICUOUS PART IN THE BITTER CONTROVERSY WHICH WAS EVOKED BY THE TEACHING OF MAIMONIDES, AND HE SOON BECAME THE AVOWED DEFENDER OF THE RATIONALISTIC PHILOSOPHY. TRAINED IN SUCH A SCHOOL HE WAS NATURALLY IMPATIENT WITH IBN EZRA'S FACILE AND SUPERFICIAL EXEGESIS. ALTHOUGH HE IS AS SENSITIVE TO DIFFICULTIES AS IBN EZRA--

AND EVEN MORE SO--HE WOULD NEVER STOOP TO SUCH SHALLOW EXPEDIENTS AS THE LATTER OFTEN RESORTS TO IN ORDER TO EXPLAIN THEM AWAY. HE FEELS THE DANGER OF ASSUMING SUCH A RADICAL PRINCIPLE AS א"ן  
 מוקדם ומאוחר בתורה AND ALWAYS STRIVES TO PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF THE PENTATEUCH EVEN WHERE THE BUNGLING OF THE REDACTOR HAS MADE THE PROCESS EXTREMELY DIFFICULT. AND SO NAHMANI OFTEN ARRIVES AT AND FORMULATES CANONS OF INTERPRETATION OF HIS OWN. HIS AIM SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN TO STEER A MIDDLE COURSE BETWEEN THE TIMID NAIIVETÉ OF RASHI ON THE ONE HAND AND THE SCEPTICAL INDIFFERENCE OF IBN EZRA ON THE OTHER. THE WORK OF NAHMANI THEREFORE WAS CALCULATED TO FORTIFY THE OLD TOTTERING VIEWS WITH THE RAMPARTS OF RATIONALISM AND TO SECURE TO DECLINING TRADITIONALISM A FIRMER FOUNDATION.

The essential characteristics here noted will come out in the following examples. We have said that N often criticises IE. Thus (Cf. above ) the word ויקרא in Ex.19<sup>3b</sup> is rendered by IE as the pluperfect, 'God had called unto him,' implying thereby that for this reason Moses ascended the mountain. N disagrees with the interpretation on the ground that in God's words there is no allusion made to an invitation for Moses to come up. He takes אל האלהים to mean: (Moses ascended the mount in part) to present himself to God = towards God, to be ready for his message ( להודיע לפני ).

Again IE's explanation as to how Moses' lieutenant is called Joshua in Ex.17<sup>1</sup> when he is not given the name until Nm.10<sup>16</sup> (Cf. above ) seems to have been too superficial for N. IE had said that he is here called Joshua by anticipation. N on the other hand thinks that the name was given him long before the event of the spies as told in Nm.10. The change of name was there only made public.

We have seen how ready the rabbis were when pressed by a difficulty to assume the lack of chronological arrangement in the Tora. Thus (Cf. above ) IE asserts that Ex.4<sup>9</sup> is anterior to Ex.4<sup>18</sup>. N repudiates the explanation. v,19 is the sequel of v,18. At first Moses decides to go to Egypt incoognito ( מתנכר ) whereon God informs him that, owing to the death of his enemies in



where it is forced to admit the lack of chronological order,  
he tries to make its absence plausible of ad Angl.  
th.

Egypt there is no necessity for disguise. Thus while at first Moses intends to return by himself so as not to imperil the life of those dependent on him, he now proceeds to take with him wife and child. The flaw in IE's harmony is that if vs.19 be anterior to 18, then it would refer to his first communication from God which was received near Mt. Sinai, while the interview in v,19 is supposed to have taken place in Midian.

Again, we have seen the syntactical difficulty which arises if we attempt to regard Ex. 4<sup>10-21</sup> as the sequel to 4<sup>1-9</sup> (Cf.above ) S explains אין מוקדם ומאוחר מדיוקדים במקרא. So IE: ויאמר זה אשר לו במדין. N, on the other hand, adheres to the apparent chronological sequence. He seems to take וישב in the sense 'and he started for Egypt' (i.e. the impf. consecutive in the inceptive force): thus, 'as he took the rod and started on the way, God said: As you are now on your way to Egypt ( הנה אתה הולך = בלכתך ) think of the signs, etc. Of course those alluded to in 3<sup>20</sup>. Another explanation: The three signs intended for the sceptical Israelites were also to be wrought before Pharaoh, and were indeed executed before Pharaoh, though Scripture does not explicitly mention the execution. ( ואע"כ שלא נכתב ). This is a canon of interpretation which is original with N. 'When in consequence of the juxtaposition of two sources, the same event is to take place with some variation, it is to be inferred that the two took place though the execution of only one is recorded.'

We have seen (Cf.above ) S assumes Ex. 24<sup>1</sup> to be an antichronism. N would not admit the antichronism. ( ואין הפרשיות באות בסדרן ולא כמשמען כלל ) and assumes the existence of chronological order with IE. ^

N is extremely sensitive to the presence of incongruities. Thus we have seen (Cf. above ) the difficulty respecting the first station reached by Israel after Sinai, whether it is Taberah or Kibrot-Hattawah. Another difficulty is (Cf. Bacon T.T.E.p.169) that unless we make the violent supposition that Taberah and Kibroth were the same place there is no room for Nm. 11<sup>1-3</sup> between Nm.10<sup>34</sup> and Nm. 11<sup>4</sup> . This 'violent supposition' is exactly what N makes. ad. loc.

In Ex.19<sup>8</sup> Israel promises to do all that Yahwe hath spoken' but have not yet received commandment to do anything. (Cf.Bacon T.T.E.p.101 note†). N explains v,7<sup>8</sup> 'and Moses set before them (elders of the people) all these words which Yahwe commanded them' as meaning, 'Moses said to the people: I place before you these things: choose ye, whether you would do thus. Therefore they answered, All that God has said we will do.'

Ex. 16<sup>12</sup> contains P's account of the sending of the quails; J's parallel story is found in Nm. 11. N ad. Ex. 16<sup>12</sup>, says that the first sending of the quails was only for the great people. Hence the rabble complained and Nm. 11 declares how they received quails also.

The appointment of the judges alluded to in Dt. 1<sup>9-18</sup> evidently restates the event told in Ex. 18. Dt. 1<sup>9</sup> the men to be selected for the purpose are said to be 'wise and understanding and known' while Ex. 18<sup>21</sup> the choice is to be determined by the moral qualities of the men to be selected. ("Men of worth, fearers of God, men of faithfulness, hating unjust gain") (Cf. Dr. P. 17). S following Siphre connects לְשֹׁטְפִים with וְיָדוּעִים (against the accentuation). N, however, connects (עַל דֶּךָ גִּבְשֵׁט) the word לְשֹׁטְפִים with הָבֹו adding that וְיָדוּעִים means indeed יָדוּעִים לְשֹׁטְפִים i.e. as Driver says, 'of proved character and ability.' (שְׁמֵעֵלֶם יָדוּעָ וְבִרְתָּ לְמִנּוּתָם בְּהַשׁוּפִים): Thus 'the term יָדוּעִים implies moral qualifications.' וְכָל מַעֲלֵוֹת הַשׁוּפִים בְּמַלְתּוֹ וְיָדוּעִים כִּי הַשׁוּפִים צָרִיכִין לְהִיְתָּ אֲנָשֵׁי הַיָּל וְיִרְאֵי אֱלֹהִים אֲנָשֵׁי אֲמוֹרָ וְשֹׁנְאֵי בַעַץ כְּאִשֶׁר אָמַר יְתִרֹ

as N says

P. Besides the canon of harmonistic interpretation formulated by N mentioned above we have several others. In Ex. 3<sup>1</sup> to 4<sup>17</sup>, relating the charge of Yahwe to Moses to deliver the people, the narratives of J and E are dovetailed into each other in a very complex manner. The sources are divided as follows. E = 3<sup>1, 4<sup>6</sup>, 5<sup>9-14</sup>, 7<sup>12</sup>, 4<sup>14</sup>, 6<sup>17</sup> J = 3<sup>2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8</sup> 4<sup>1-14, 15-16</sup>. As the result of this analysis. Ex. 4<sup>17</sup> (E) 'and thou shalt take in thine hand this rod wherewith thou shalt do the signs' refers back to Ex. 3<sup>20</sup> (E) 'and I will put forth my hand and smite Egypt with all my wonders which I will do in the midst thereof.' The signs in E refer to the wonders, which God will at some future time bring upon the Egyptians, i.e. the plagues. As the blended text now stands, however, we naturally combine 4<sup>17</sup> with the portion immediately preceding it and refer the signs to the three miracles of 4<sup>1-9</sup> (J) with which Moses is to persuade the Israelites of the truth of his mission. The 'signs' of E and the 'signs' of J are entirely separate and distinct affairs. What 'signs' then are referred to in Ex. 4<sup>17</sup> when Moses is told to take in his hand the rod--the instrument of their accomplishment? One would naturally suppose the signs of Ex. 4<sup>1-9</sup> described immediately preceding. But there only one of the signs is done by the rod, viz: 'The conversion into the snake' (4<sup>3</sup>) while 4<sup>17</sup> implies that all the signs are done by the rod? IE (in N's phraseology) says Ex. 4<sup>17</sup> the signs = the signs which I shall mention to thee later on. (הָאֵתוֹת אֲשֶׁר אוֹמֵר אֵלֶיךָ). N accepts the interpretation but would wish to find an antecedent for the signs. Since that antecedent cannot be looked for in the immediately preceding portion, he locates it in Ex. 3<sup>20</sup> 'all my wonders which I will do in the midst thereof.' Thus unconsciously N anticipates the results of the critical analysis. He asserts at the same</sup>

time that in the oral interview recorded in 3<sup>19-22</sup> (we say; in the original of E part of which has been suppressed by R) the wonders alluded to were specified (הידיע איתן בפרט) but that the Writer (we would say; the editor) finds it convenient to leave out the specifications in this place. (הכתוב יקצר). This is a recurrent principle with N. (For another example of this canon Cf. N ad. Ex.10<sup>2</sup>).

According to Wellh. (Prol. p.71 and foot-note 2.) the old custom did not prohibit the use of leaven in cereal offerings. It seems rather (Cf. Amos 4<sup>5</sup>) that an offering of leavened bread was considered a sumptuous gift and was therefore the occasion for display on the part of the rich on festal occasions. Thus the law of H (Lv.23<sup>7</sup>) requires two cakes of leavened bread to be offered as *בבוקרים* on the holiday which takes its name from this term, coupled with two lambs as a peace offering; (Cf. Driver's analysis in his ed. of Lv., Haupt's bible); the animal sacrifice plus the two cakes are waved; the cakes (this is apparently the meaning) being given to the priests. According to the law Lv.2<sup>11</sup> which says that no cereal offering can be made of leaven is of late origin (according to analysis, from P). Lv. 2<sup>12</sup> is then harmonistic i.e. in the new law an exception is made in favor of the *בבוקרים*. From the point of view of P the rationale of this exception lies in the explicit statement that leaven must not be offered on the altar (the *בבוקרים* were not offered on the altar but were presented to priest.) Wellh. correctly finds in Lv. 7<sup>13</sup> a reminiscence of the old practice while 7<sup>12</sup> is a redactional addition in harmony with the new law, the intention of the author of this verse apparently being to place the unleavened cakes in the foreground as the main feature of the offering and to make of the leavened cakes a sort of an appendix. To this harmony we owe the confusion in the present text (Cf. the impossible construction in v,13). Let us see what N has to say. He wonders why in 2<sup>12</sup> when Scripture makes the exception for the use of leaven in the case of *בבוקרים* it does not at the same time state the similar exception in the case of *תודה*. This is no question, he says. The law in Lv. 2<sup>11</sup> 'No cereal offering is to be made of leaven' is fully explained in the next verse as referring only to cereal offerings, part of which is offered on the altar. The law therefore really reads: No cereal offerings which are offered on the altar can be made of leaven. It is self evident now that the *תודה* bread which is not offered on the altar does not come under the law at all. The exception being self evident it is not necessary for Scripture to state it in this place, (especially since the use of leaven for the *תודה* is explicitly mentioned elsewhere 7<sup>13</sup>). But if so, why are the *בבוקרים* explicitly excepted here (although the use of leaven in their case is explicitly prescribed elsewhere 23<sup>17</sup>)?

The answer is that the explicit exception of בבכורים here is made necessary by the fact that the law here speaks of two articles prohibited to be used on the altar--leaven and honey. While the leaven for the use of בבכורים is allowed elsewhere, that of honey is not (no occasion for doing so presenting itself). The exception in the case of leaven mentioned here is simply due to association. The harmonistic canon resulting from this interpretation is 'Scripture may state in one place a general law without giving at the same place the exceptions, if there is an occasion somewhere else to name the cases which are not subject to the law. Nor does Scripture ever in so many words stop to signalize a case of divergent practice as an exception to a law recorded elsewhere. The combination is to be made by the reader.' Thus he says, Scripture when prohibiting work on the Sabbath day Ex.31<sup>4</sup> does not find it necessary to add: 'except work in connection with the sacrificial culte.' It simply says when it comes to speak of the cycle of offerings 'And on the Sabbath day two he-lambs of one year, etc.' (Nm.28<sup>4f</sup>). Thus again the general law 'the nakedness of thy brother's wife thou shalt not uncover' Lv.18<sup>16</sup> is not accompanied by the limitation to all cases except the levirate Dt. 25<sup>5f</sup>; and conversely when the levirate is introduced it is not necessary to state that it is an exception to the law in Lv.' In either case the reader will combine in his own mind both passages as co-existing i.e. a rational reader of the whole of the Pentateuch must naturally be a harmonist. With such a canon of course the existence of contradictions in the Tora is made impossible. It is but a restatement in rational language of the old Midrashic principle ( שניהם בדבור אחד נאמר ).

In Ex.12 we have the ceremonial of the passover first (v, 1-20 P) outlined in God's commandment to Moses and Aaron and secondly (v,21-23 J) in Moses' announcement to the elders of Israel. Bacon says (T.T.E.p.58) 'By the present arrangement of the material the ordinance of the passover in vv, 21-27 is brought in after its parallel vv, 1-13, as Moses' re-iteration to the people of what Yahwe had spoken to him and Aaron. But in that case Moses ought at least to tell what he was told and not something quite different. Yet he leaves out three-fourths of what is directed in 12<sup>4f</sup> and quite alters the form of the very simple directions he gives in v, 21f.' N observes the difficulty and frames the following canon of harmony. 'Of two sections, one containing the commandment issued by God to the legislator and the other the execution as directed by the latter, the second passage need not give everything in detail (implying that everything was carried out) while again it may introduce some new points (which must be understood to have been really given by God to Moses though they had been omitted in the first record.)' (N ad. Ex 12<sup>21</sup>).

XIV. IT BECOMES APPROPRIATE IN THIS PLACE TO ILLUSTRATE BY MEANS OF WELL CHOSEN-WE MAY SAY CLASSIC-EXAMPLES THE CHARACTERISTICS WHICH HARMONISTIC INTERPRETATION REVEALS WHEN IT HAS TO DEAL WITH COMPLEXITIES WHICH EXTEND THROUGH LARGER AREAS OF THE TEXT. AT THE SAME TIME, THE SPECIFIC FEATURES OF THE THREE EXEGETES WHOM WE HAVE BEEN CONSIDERING IN THIS CHAPTER, MIGHT BE FURTHER ELUCIDATED AND BROUGHT HOME WITH GREATER DISTINCTNESS BY THE PARALLEL JUXTAPOSITION OF THEIR EFFORTS WHICH SUCH RESEARCH WOULD RENDER NECESSARY. THE MATERIAL FOR THE WORK WE HAVE AT HAND, BUT AS THE BULK OF THIS ESSAY WOULD HAVE TO BE THEREBY CONSIDERABLY INCREASED, WE RESERVE THE LABOR OF DRAWING UP THESE ILLUSTRATIONS UNTIL TIME IS MORE GENEROUS OF HER GIFTS THAN SHE IS AT PRESENT.

XV. RATIONALISM AFTER ALL IS NOT SO WIDELY REMOVED FROM CRITICISM. IT IS INTERESTING TO OBSERVE HOW WORKING ALL THE TIME FROM THE TRADITIONAL STANDPOINT THE MEDIEVAL EXEGETES OFTEN ANTICIPATE THE RESULTS OF THE MODERN CRITICAL ANALYSIS.

In addition to the example given above ( ) we mention the following. S anticipates the results of the analysis in placing Ex. 24<sup>1</sup> קודם עשרת הדברות before the theophany in which the ten commandments are given. (So J) and Ex.24<sup>2</sup> לאחר מותן הורה after the theophany (So E).

According to the reconstructed text of J the narrative of the theophany at Sinai reads as follows (Cf.Ex.19). 'Israel encamped at Sinai. The mountain smoked and Yahwe descended to the top of the mountain. Moses went up and received instructions to warn the people and cause the priests to sanctify themselves. For to-morrow Yahwe will come down within the sight of all the people. And thou (Moses) and Aaron with thee and the priests shall come up unto Yahwe. When the 'ram's horn' soundeth long these shall come up to the mount. (On the morrow there were lightnings and thunders on the mount with fire and smoke. And when the ram's horn was heard Yahwe spoke.....) But unto Moses he said (24<sup>1</sup>) 'Come up unto Yahwe thou and

Aaron, Nadab and Abihu and the seventy elders of Israel.' (Cf. Bacon T.T.E.p.296). As the text now stands, however, v, 13 b indeed directs that when the ram's horn soundeth these (emphatic) shall come up to the mount. But this is the last we hear of the ram's horn and who 'these' may be we have no means whatever of determining. IE agrees with Rab<sub>x</sub> Samuel ben Hofni who identifies 'these' with Aaron and his sons and the seventy elders--which agrees with the results of the analysis.

C O N C L U S I O N.



OUR THESIS IS PROVEN. WE HAVE SEEN THAT THE WORK OF REDACTION WAS NOT COMPLETE WHEN THE TEXT OF THE TORAH BECAME FIXED. NUMEROUS CONTRADICTIONS AND INCONGRUITIES HAD YET TO BE HARMONIZED. THE REDACTORIAL DIASKEUE WAS THEREFORE TRANSFERRED TO THE FIELD OF EXEGESIS AND APPEARS AS WE HAVE SHOWN IN THE READINGS OF THE OLD TRANSLATIONS, IN THE 'APPLIED' EXEGESIS OF THE TALMUDIC-MIDRASHIC LITERATURE AND IN THE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE MEDIEVAL EXEGETES.

THE ESSENTIAL UNITY OF THE REDACTORIAL WORK AND HARMONISTIC EXEGESIS IS PROVEN BY THE FACT THAT OFTEN IMPLIED REDACTIONAL HARMONIES ARE MADE EXPLICIT THROUGH INTERPRETATION.

Examples of this fact abound. We select a few at random. In Nm. 16<sup>32f</sup> we are told that Qorah, his followers and all that appertain to them went down alive into the pit and the earth closed in upon them. One is truly staggered then to read in Nm. 26<sup>11</sup> that 'notwithstanding the sons of Qorah died not.' Evidently this verse is a redactional interpolation intended to account for the existence of the Levitical guild of temple-singers 'the sons of Qorah' (see titles of Pss. and Cf. Nm. 26<sup>58</sup>). (Cf. Bacon T.T.E. p.190). IE(ad.26<sup>11</sup>) explicitly states the implication of the redactor.

In Ex. 6<sup>2-12</sup> (P) God reveals himself to Moses as Yahwe and sends him to the children of Israel. They refuse to listen to him. When Moses is then sent to Pharaoh he objects, first because of the improbability of Pharaoh's listening to him, since the Israelites did not; second, because of his indifferent success as an orator. The parallel account in JE Ex.3-4 runs as follows: God reveals himself to Moses as Yahwe and sends him to Israel. They listen to him (4 ). When Pharaoh makes their burden harder they resent the interference of Moses. R treated JE and P as successive accounts. No difficulty was felt that the Israelites did not listen the second time, though they did the first. Something had happened meanwhile which embittered Israel. וַיַּעֲבֹדָה קָשָׁה offers the bridge. This is explicitly stated by the commentators. Sbm ad. 6<sup>1</sup> 'But they hearkened not unto Moses for anguish of spirit and for cruel bondage.' .... although they did believe the first time, because then they expected to rest from their hard labor. Similarly IE and N. 'They hearkened not.... for they were impatient at the servitude and heavy work which was now

renewed (note  $\eta\omega\tau\eta\eta\eta\eta\omega$  ) to them.  $\S$  says that even the revelation of the name of Yahwe (Cf. above ) could not console them in their cruel bondage. (  $\eta\lambda\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \tau\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$  )  
 Similarly the two accounts of the naming of Jacob are harmonized by the redactorial  $\tau\eta\gamma$  (Gn.35<sup>9</sup>) (Cf. above ) which is made explicit by  $\S$ . 'God appeared to Jacob twice,-- once on his way to and once on his return from Paddan Aram' Cf S ad Gn 35<sup>9</sup>.

THE WORK OF THE EXEGETES WAS NOT A SELF-IMPOSED TASK. IT WAS FORCED UPON THEM BY THE DEMANDS OF REASON AND OF COMMON SENSE. NOBLY DID THEY RESPOND TO THE CALL. NOTHING CAN BE MORE INSTRUCTIVE AND INSPIRING THAN TO WATCH THE DEVELOPMENT FROM THE NAIVE EXPOSITIONS OF RASHI, THROUGH THE POORLY DISGUISED SCEPTICISM OF IBN EZRA TO THE CANDOR AND SINCERITY OF NAHMANI. ALONG WITH THIS DEVELOPMENT WE CAN TRACE A GROWING SENSITIVENESS TO DIFFICULTIES, SOLUTIONS TO WHICH BY THE LATER EXEGETES ARE OFTEN SO INGENIOUS AND AT THE SAME TIME SO PLAUSIBLE THAT THEY HAVE FOUND THEIR WAY INTO MODERN TEXT-BOOKS. MOREOVER, WHEN WE CONSIDER THE VASTNESS AND AT THE SAME TIME THE HOPELESSNESS OF THEIR TASK WE FEEL CERTAIN THAT THE TRADITIONAL OPINION OF THE UNITY OF THE PENTATEUCH HAS BEEN ABLY CHAMPIONED AND HAS BEEN DONE AMPLE JUSTICE BY REDACTIONAL EXEGESIS. WE COME AWAY FROM THIS FASCINATING STUDY WITH A SPIRIT OF REVERENCE FOR THESE PIONEERS IN THE FIELD OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION AND CAN SAFELY SAY THAT THEIR WORK COMPARES WELL WITH AND OFTEN SURPASSES THE LABORS OF MODERN APOLGETES.

WE HAVE ALREADY GIVEN EXPRESSION TO THE PARADOX OF TRADITIONALISM, VIZ: THAT ITS EXPONENTS WERE OFTEN COMPELLED TO ADVANCE VIEWS WHICH WERE CLEARLY SUBVERSIVE OF THE TRADITIONAL THEORY. UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF RATIONALISM THE BREACH WIDENED. MANY HARMONISTIC INTERPRETATIONS MERELY MADE THE DIFFICULTIES INVOLVED MORE APPARENT.

THE EPIGONI COMING AFTER THE AGE OF THE MASTERS DID NOT ADD MATERIALLY TO THE SCIENCE. HARDLY ANY GAIN IS TO BE DERIVED FROM ABRA-BANEL'S (d.1508) BULKY COMMENTARY OR THAT OF HIS IMITATOR MANASSEH BEN ISRAEL (d.1657). FROM THESE TO CRITICISM WAS BUT A STEP. ASTRUC (1753), (WHO REFERS TO MANASSEH BEN ISRAEL) CAME FORWARD WITH THE STATEMENT THAT GENESIS IS A BOOK OF COMPOSITE CHARACTER. AT LAST THE KEY TO ALL DIFFICULTIES IS FOUND. THE UNITY OF THE PENTATEUCH IS THE UNITY OF REDACTION. THUS THE WORK OF ANALYSIS BEGINS AND THE PROBLEM <sup>is</sup> OUTLINED TO RETRACE THE PROCESS OF SUCCESSIVE REDACTIONS AND REVEAL THE CONTENT OF THE ORIGINAL PENTATEUCH-CELLS.

BUT ANALYSIS IS ONLY ONE PHASE OF CRITICISM. IT MUST BE SUPPLEMENTED BY A WIDE SYNTHESIS OR THE TASK IS INCOMPLETE. THE 'COMPOSITION OF THE HEXATEUCH' MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY THE 'PROLEGOMENA TO THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL.'

THE MATERIAL UNITY OF THE PENTATEUCH--TRADITIONALISM ONCE FORSAKEN--IS INDEED LOST, BUT ITS IDEAL UNITY IS FOUND. THE SUCCESSIVE CODES ARE WITNESSES OF SUCCESSIVE REVELATIONS. THE VARIOUS NARRATIVES TELL A TALE NOT OF THE 'DESCENT OF MAN' BUT OF THE 'ASCENT OF MAN.' THE HISTORY OF THESE DOCUMENTS IS THE UNFOLDING OF GOD'S ONE AND SINGLE MESSAGE TO ISRAEL AND HUMANITY: 'BE HOLY FOR I AM HOLY.'