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

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

ARTICLE VIII.

PROFESSOR LOFTHOUSE AND THE CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH.

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

IN the *London Quarterly Review*[1] for October, 1914, Professor W. F. Lofthouse published a note, under the title "Dahse *v.* Wellhausen," attacking the writings of Dahse and myself and supporting the Graf-Wellhausen theory. As the article contained serious misrepresentations I sent in a short note to the January number of the same periodical under the title "Has Professor Lofthouse Vindicated the Documentary Theory?" The professor replied in the same number and asked me several questions. These I sought to answer, so far as space permitted, in the April number of the same review, in an article on "The Mosaic Authenticity of the Pentateuchal Legislation," and to this Professor Lofthouse replied in the same number, complaining that he could not refer to all my points in a note and that the editor had closured him. Instead of devoting what space he had to my points, he proceeded to raise others which necessitate further discussion, and in any case it would be desirable that the professor should be given the fullest opportunities of expounding the deathless verities of the higher criticism to an interested audience in a review where he cannot ride off on the plea of lack of space. If this was the real and only reason for his passing over my arguments, he will now find this

[1] Hereafter referred to as LQR.

disability removed; but if not, it will be easy enough to judge the theory, that the God of truth revealed himself through the instrumentality of literary forgers and "pious" frauds, by the conduct of its champions.

In the January number I had invited Professor Lofthouse to deal in detail with the sixth chapter of my "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism." I regret to say that he has not done so, though in the same number he made some remarks which I refuted in the April number. I wish now, while further pressing on him the necessity of carefully studying and answering that chapter point by point, to make such further observations as may be of assistance to him in this task. It must be remembered that the professor has edited Ezekiel in the Century Bible, and while the book is necessarily of small compass to meet the requirements of the series, it is unquestionably one of the very best commentaries that have appeared on any book of the Bible in recent years. Its author is distinguished by the possession of a literary gift and a sense of proportion that are, unhappily, extremely rare in modern commentators; and, though the book suffers from his belief in the critical view, it yet does very much to interpret the prophet's meaning in clear and elegant style. I propose therefore to make full use of this little volume, for the purpose of bringing home to the professor the nature of his task; and at the same time I shall devote considerable attention to the bearing of Ezekiel on the problem of the Pentateuch, in view of the fact that this should have special weight with one who has written a commentary on the prophet.

In commenting on the word "horns" in Ezekiel xliii. 15 (CB,[1] p. 318), Lofthouse writes: "The oldest altars, simply

[1] I use CB throughout to denote Professor Lofthouse's edition of Ezekiel in the Century Bible.

built of unhewn stone, would seem to have possessed no horns (Exod. xx. 25)." Earlier in the same note we read: "Horns are mentioned in connexion with the Davidic altar in 1 Kings i. 50, ii. 28. These passages, with Amos iii. 14, would imply that they formed a peculiarly sacred part of the altar." Again, on xliii. 13–17 (CB, p. 316), we read: "Solomon's temple had contained the bronze altar (1 Kings viii. 64) of burnt offering. . . . In Exod. xx. 24 the altar is to be of earth, or, at most, of unhewn stones; to use an iron tool on it is pollution." That is to say Lofthouse himself fully recognizes the fact that there were two kinds of altars coexisting at a date before that to which he assigns any of the Pentateuchal documents. They differed in materials, construction, and appearance; and they differed so materially that no contemporary could have confused them. That completely answers his statement on page 131 of the January LQR: "But there is nothing to suggest in Dt. xii. *or elsewhere* that any distinction is to be made between lay and priestly altars" (my italics, H. M. W.). The differences are so clearly expressed elsewhere that Lofthouse did not fail to see and note them.

Now let us carry the matter a little further. Remembering on the one hand such historical examples of the cairn altar as Manoah's rock and Saul's altar after Michmash, and on the other the horned altars of David and Solomon, let us invite Lofthouse to explain to what Exodus xxi. 14 refers, "thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he shall die." Does he contend that that was a cairn altar? Or would, e.g., a cattle thief be able after stealing sundry herd of cattle to sacrifice one at a mound of earth or stones and then contend that such an altar was a "sanctuary," and that he could take refuge at it? Or does the professor suppose that such altars ever had priesthoods? Or was it for such an altar that the

Gibeonites were to hew wood and draw water (Josh. ix. 27)? Or could the first ripe fruits of Exodus xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 26, be brought to it? When he has considered these questions, let Lofthouse carefully study the whole of the sixth chapter of my "Essays" with Wellhausen's "Prolegomena" before him, and then let him try to answer me point by point.

There is, however, another matter to which I must refer. On pages 268–270 of the April LQR I pointed out once more that a cairn altar would not become a house or develop a door or doorpost on being called a "sanctuary." I showed how critics had supposed that it would, and had pinned the ear of the slave of Exodus xxi. 6 to such a door or doorpost, and I wrote: "The critics have never admitted their error, for it is too humiliating. On this basis they reconstruct the whole history of Israel, for it is this which is the foundation of what Wellhausen has called his 'whole position.'" I challenge Lofthouse to deal with this matter fairly and squarely, and either justify the conduct of the critics or else admit the blunder and do all in his power to check its further propagation and remedy the consequences. Let him go with his pupils to a large stone or mound and call it a sanctuary, and see if he can affix an ear to its door or doorpost. Doubtless any of his pupils will gladly lend an ear for the purpose if he understands that it will be transfixed only in the event of the Wellhausen theory proving true in actual practice. If the door or doorpost thereupon makes an appearance and the ceremony is triumphantly performed, I shall gladly admit myself wrong. But if not, let the professor bear himself with reverent and dolorous mien befitting the solemnity of the occasion, for he will be standing at the tomb of those figments of the Teutonic imagination, Messrs. J, E, D, and P.

From sanctuaries Lofthouse passes on to the Names of

God; but what he has to say on this has been abundantly answered by me in "The Swansong of the Wellhausen School," now reprinted on pages 49–89 of "Pentateuchal Studies," and I commend the whole of that article to his most careful study. His remarks about the age of Abraham and Sarah are met on pages 81 f. of the same volume. Further, he has failed to answer many of the points I have put to him on pages 265 ff. of the April article.

Lofthouse next deals with the attitude of the Wellhausen critics to the Priestly Code:—

"And the writers of the same school have made it quite clear, first, that to them P is as little a 'forgery about the time of Ezra' as to their critics, and secondly that the laws it contains are of varying ages, some of them very ancient, Ezra being the collector and promulgator and not the writer" (LQR, April, 1915, p. 277).

Reserving the question of forgery for discussion later on, I would point out immediately that this absolutely contradicts the views that Lofthouse himself expressed no further back than October last. He then wrote that P dated

"from some time before 444 B.C. . . . P, like E, uses *Elohim* till the call of Moses, but in other respects he offers a strong contrast both to E and J. His style is legal and precise, entirely lacking in the colour that is characteristic of the other two writers; his conception of the Deity is strongly anti-anthropomorphic; his presentation of the events in the ancient history of Israel is often different from that of J and E, both in general character and in details; his interest chiefly lies in matters to which they pay but little attention; and he has a vocabulary of his own which is as distinct from that of the other two as the vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel is distinct from that of the Synoptics. . . . It is pointed out that, as regards its legal provisions, Deuteronomy stands midway between the earlier documents and P; and that a sketch of sacrificial law, midway between Deut. and P, but really in agreement with neither, is found in Ezekiel, whose work, were P Mosaic, or even known in the time of Ezekiel himself, would be unintelligible" (LQR, October, 1914, pp. 334 f.).

Nothing there, it will be observed, about laws being very

ancient, or about Ezra being the collector and promulgator and not the writer.

Similarly, on pages 27 ff. of CB, Lofthouse writes of P:—

"The rest of the law exhibits quite different features. It is scattered up and down the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, with very little perceptible arrangement, but with a very distinct system and even vocabulary of its own. If these laws are all taken from their surroundings and arranged according to their subject-matter, it will be found that the state of things which they contemplate is further removed from Deuteronomy than is Deuteronomy from the Book of the Covenant. We shall find ourselves in possession of a code of which the central idea is a nation organized for worship, under the guidance of a priestly class subdivided into high-priest, priests, and Levites. The institution of a central shrine is never commanded; it is uniformly taken for granted. Not a word is said to imply the existence of a monarchy or of those simple conditions which prevailed before the time of Saul; the necessities of civil government are hardly thought of, and the elaborateness of the feasts with their accompanying sacrifices, now wholly distinct from the popular festivals with which they were identified in the first code, imply that people as well as priests were content to regard the due celebration of ritual as their first business. We even find that ancient history has been rewritten in accord with the religious views of this body of law. *It is difficult to imagine when this code could have been obeyed, except after the return from Babylon, or when it could have been composed, except during and after the exile* [my italics, H. M. W.].

"But now comes the crucial question. What is the relation of Ezekiel's code to all this? He too has his laws of priests, of sacrifices, and of festivals; to which sections of the Pentateuch do they correspond? Another question should be asked first, Why did he need to draw up any code at all? Why could he not be content with what existed already? If the whole of the Pentateuchal law be regarded as having existed from the time of Moses, this question becomes peculiarly difficult. . . . A very brief inspection is sufficient to show that Ezekiel's code, however it was intended, lies between Deuteronomy and the developed Levitical legislation which is now generally known as the Priests' code; it could not have been written without the first; it could not have been written had the second been known to the author."

So instead of holding the laws very ancient he here regards P as having been composed during and after the Exile. Nor

is this an exceptional statement of the critical view. I confine myself to quoting one book of authority. On page xliv of his "Numbers," Dr. Gray writes as follows: "The greater part of Numbers (P) is of no earlier origin than the 6th or 5th cent. B.C.; much of it is still later."

With Lofthouse's points on Ezekiel I will deal later, but on these statements three important questions arise: (1) What has caused his *volte-face?* (2) What does he mean by very ancient? (3) What becomes of the alleged unity of style and the arguments built on it if portions of the code are very ancient and others very late?

The answer to the first question is, that in the interval he had read (albeit hastily) a portion, though unhappily not the whole, of my "Pentateuchal Studies," and had been confronted with a few points from that and the "Origin of the Pentateuch." It will be well to press these a little further.

I had written: "Assuming 'P' to be an exilic or post-exilic document, the critics proceed to lay down that it is really legislation intended for that age served up in Mosaic dress, and that the Tabernacle is really a projection of the second Temple. All the references to the wilderness, etc., are merely so much make-up. In reality we are to think of the times of Ezra as the historical background of the Priestly Code which is to be regarded as midway between Ezekiel and the Chronicler" (LQR, April, 1915, p. 271). It will be seen that this entirely accords with the view stated by Lofthouse in CB quoted above. "It is difficult to imagine when this code could have been obeyed, except after the return from Babylon, or when it could have been composed, except during and after the exile." Now let us take the points one by one. I wrote: "In reply to this I refer to pp. 292–326 of Orr's *Problem of the Old Testament,* which the critics have

never dared to answer in detail" (p. 271). On this Lofthouse says never a word. I challenge him to deal with this discussion. I then wrote: "The priesthood is conceived as so simple that it is vested in a family consisting of one man and his sons. At the same time a whole tribe is set aside for duties of porterage and little else. They are to carry about the tent of meeting, i.e. the projection of the second Temple! What earthly bearing could such regulations have on the post-exilic age? Is it really credible that anybody expected the Temple to be taken to pieces, carried about, and set up again, at odd times without rhyme or reason? Or does Professor Lofthouse imagine that if a post-exilic Levite read regulations to that effect applying ostensibly only to the Tent of Meeting during the period of the wanderings, he would understand thereby that he was to perform in the second Temple many centuries thereafter duties which, according to 'P,' would incur death for him? For that is what it comes to. In their haste to establish their theory the critics have overlooked the fact that the Chronicler is *not* in accord with P as to the duties of the Levites, and assigns to them tasks that would have been visited with death by P" (pp. 271 f.). Lofthouse now says that the laws are of varying ages, some very ancient. At what age does he suppose that the Temple was to be carried about and that a whole tribe was set aside for its porterage? "It is clear," he now writes, "too that the codifiers of P had a comparatively small community around Jerusalem in mind" (p. 277). Will he explain the practicability and precise utility of carrying about the Temple in the midst of a small community around Jerusalem? Will he further tell us why P visits with death duties assigned to the Levites by the Chronicler? I particularly invite his attention to what Gray says on pages xliv f. of his "Numbers":—

"The organisation, position, and duties of the Levites, and the fiscal system for the support of priests and Levites, as described and presupposed in various parts of the book, cannot be harmonised with earlier Hebrew evidence; they correspond to an ecclesiastical organisation that first became established many centuries after Moses; see pp. 21–25, 236–241. (*d*) Many of the laws are expressly stated to be for the regulation of life in Canaan; few of the rest have any relation to nomadic life. In the abstract this may not be incompatible with the promulgation of them by Moses; but such an origin is highly improbable, and not to be accepted on the evidence of so late a work; many of the particular laws contain much that is definitely inconsistent with Mosaic origin, and point to a relatively late age."

That is the case of the Wellhausen school. Either Lofthouse can justify this against "Pentateuchal Studies" and the "Origin of the Pentateuch" or he cannot. Kuenen and Baudissin admitted that the laws as to priests and Levites do not fit any post-Mosaic age. A tribe of sacred porters is obviously suitable to the desert period, but to no other. And what about the provisions for the construction and transport of the Ark? And the various other points urged in the "Origin of the Pentateuch" and the LQR? To what dates does Lofthouse assign these laws? Further, if they were very ancient, Ezekiel and the other prophets must have known them. How does this fit Lofthouse's position? Lastly, I pressed him with points showing the Mosaic date of Numbers xxxi.–xxxvi., supposed by the critics to be very late indeed,[1] and all he can say is that they are very ancient! He seeks to show that Leviticus xiv. 34 ff. cannot be Mosaic, because it refers to the house, but he should read verses 33 f., "And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, When ye be come into the land of Canaan," etc. That explains itself.

I therefore press Lofthouse to explain what he means by

[1] See, further, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, chap. v.; Origin of the Pentateuch, pp. 124–128.

very ancient, why he so thoroughly contradicts his own earlier statements and the writings of the critical protagonists, and what he has to say about the alleged unity of style. Was P a gentleman who lived from the time of Moses (when presumably the "very ancient laws" were composed) to that of Ezra, and continued to write in the same style throughout the centuries? Or was there a school of writers continuously active and maintaining for some 900 or 1,000 years a style that was so distinctive that nobody who is unable to distinguish between a mound and a house could possibly mistake a line of their writing for the work of anybody else? Or what does he mean? Certainly his inconsistencies urgently require a fresh restatement of the amended critical position.

Properly interpreted, the language of the prophet Ezekiel leaves no doubt as to his acquaintance with P. Apart from the references in writings that are earlier than Ezekiel (of which more hereafter) we have the following in the prophet. In xxii. 26 he uses language which, as I have pointed out in the "Origin of the Pentateuch" and elsewhere, must refer to Leviticus x. 10 f. Lofthouse, confronted with this in the April LQR, has ventured no word of reply. In xx. 12 Ezekiel writes: "I gave them my sabbaths to be *a sign between me and them*," an unmistakable reference to Exodus xxxi. 12–17, "sign" in covenants being supposed to be peculiar to P as contrasted with J, E, and D.[1] General references to "my statutes" and "my judgments" prove little, as they might refer to other parts of the Pentateuch; but, once the prophet's acquaintance with parts of P is made out, it is natural to assume that this is included in these phrases. In xl. 39 and elsewhere the prophet assumes the existence of the guilt offering and the sin offering. But these were created by Le-

[1] But, for the true view, see Studies in Biblical Law, chap. ii.

viticus iv. and v. Similarly such phrases as "most holy things," "the place is holy" (xlii. 13), point directly back to P or some legislation that dealt with the same topics in the same language. In xliv. 23 Ezekiel again assumes the existence of P. So too the "appointed feasts" of xxxvi. 38, xlvi. 9, are the "set feasts" of Leviticus xxiii. 4, the same word being used in the Hebrew. It is also rendered "solemnities" in Ezekiel xlvi. 11. Again, vii. 12 f., xlvi. 17, can refer only to the jubilee.[1] What then is the explanation of the seeming discrepancies between the prophet's vision and the Pentateuch? To some extent, of course, the vision contains an ideal element, and must not be interpreted in all cases as a strictly literal representation of what was to be. Further, his silence on many points is well explained by Lofthouse himself, when he writes:—

"With a directness and concentration of purpose as impressive as it is tantalizing, Ezekiel passes by what does not assist his direct object, or he merely notices a structure which he assumes to be as familiar to us as it was to him" (CB, p. 288).

This is as applicable to the legal as to the architectural portions of the vision. The other difficulties are due to four causes: (1) the text of Deuteronomy has suffered since the days of Ezekiel, who had before him a purer Hebrew MS. than our Massoretic text; (2) the text of Ezekiel has also suffered, probably through attempts at harmonization; (3) the prophet set himself to remedy abuses and to deal with circumstances which had arisen since the days of Moses; and (4) he was characteristically priestly in seeking to intensify the conception of holiness and to exalt the priestly power while depressing the secular. With regard to the textual questions I cannot do better than quote Lofthouse:—

"The Septuagint translation suggests an exceptional number of

[1] See Studies in Biblical Law, pp. 95 f.

variations from the received Hebrew text, which is represented as closely as possible in our Revised Version. It is well known that the character of the Septuagint translation (LXX) as a whole varies greatly in different parts of the Old Testament; in some books it is far more careful and close to the original than in others; in some books, again, it would seem that its original showed distinct differences from our present Hebrew text, while elsewhere the order of verses and even of chapters differs greatly from our own. In Ezekiel the translation is evidently a very careful one; where the translators misunderstood words they would simply transliterate them; the order of the Hebrew words is often preserved intentionally and, while a few passages are distinctly free from Hebraisms, literalness is often secured at the cost of idiomatic Greek, as it is also in Aquila's Greek translation of the Old Testament.

"But through this very conscientiousness the translators have made it clear that they had before them another text than that which is represented in our English Bible. For while we can generally turn their Greek back into Hebrew with ease, that Hebrew is often strangely different from the text which we possess. Nor is the difference one of accidental 'various readings,' but of character and style. No English reader will fail to notice in this book the number of redundant clauses and repeated sentences, and also the number of almost hopelessly obscure passages. In the Septuagint the obscurities are distinctly fewer, and even where they exist in the Greek, they can sometimes be got rid of by working back through the Greek to the Hebrew; while most of the redundancies and repetitions are cut away, giving an impression of vigour and even, in places, of an epigrammatic terseness of which the English version knows nothing. Further, the received text is found to be the less forcible and vigorous of the two in other ways. Attacks upon Israel's sin, as we find them in the Septuagint, are toned down; weaker expressions take the place of the stronger ones found in the Septuagint; references to heathenism are less explicit; parallels to the Priests' code and the Book of Holiness appear which are absent in the Septuagint; unfulfilled prophecies, as they appear in the Septuagint, are altered to be consistent with the facts of history; expressions not found in the Septuagint or found there in a different form read like marginal notes which have made their way into the text; while obvious numerical and other errors in the Hebrew are corrected in the Greek version.

"If we are to assume that we have here two types of text, which is the older? Until lately, it was customary to regard the Septuagint as suspect whenever it differed from the received text; but it is now claiming more and more attention, and the oldest fragment of the text of the Hebrew Bible yet discovered, the Nash

Papyrus, is certainly nearer to the original of the Septuagint than to the received text. For deciding questions of this kind, we have three canons — the shorter version is preferable to the longer; the harder version is preferable to the easier; and, that version is to be preferred from which the other can be more easily deduced. Now the Septuagint text is certainly the shorter; and to a Jewish reader it is the harder; for its peculiarities are just those which, apparently inconsistent with other parts of the Bible or unsuitable to the dignity of an inspired text, would have caused surprise and scandal to a Jew. Can we then explain the rise of the received text from an original text similar to that represented by the Septuagint? Here, conjecture is our only weapon; but it has been suggested that in the case of this book the difficulties which occasioned its special treatment by the Jewish doctors were also responsible for the systematic alterations of the text. In order that it might not be thrown out of the Canon altogether, the scribes subjected it to a thorough revision; its startling brevities were rounded off, its daring references were softened, its objectionable bluntness was smoothed down, its inconsistencies with the Pentateuch, though not removed, were made less glaring, and its allusions to previous history were assimilated to the orthodox views of later times. The result could hardly be altogether successful; Ezekiel was too forcible and individual a writer to be thus tamed and shorn of his peculiarities; hence, it is concluded, we are left with a book which exhibits at once prolixity and terseness, obscurity and almost childish simplicity, the powerful expressions of a great and original mind side by side with the cumbrous explanations of an annotator. . . . On the other hand, it is easy to exaggerate the difficulties of the received text and the excellences of the Septuagint's original. It is not probable that any Hebrew prophet wrote with the fear of the standards of German literary criticism before his eyes. That errors should have crept into the text in course of transmission, or that they should have been left in it by the author, is quite possible; cleverly manipulated, they can be made to suggest a whole series of recensions and editions; but we may be permitted to wonder that with a subject-matter so constantly obscure and involved, the errors or corruptions in the text — call them what we please — are not far more numerous, and, in all but a few passages of special difficulty, far more baffling" (CB, pp. 43–47).

In the light of these remarks I turn to Lofthouse's second argument for the dates he assigns to Deuteronomy and P:—

"Deuteronomy contemplates monarchical rule and foreign wars.

The Priests' code never alludes to one or the other; but regards the high-priest as the supreme head of the community. Ezekiel knows nothing of a high-priest; on the other hand, he replaces the king of the older régime by a 'prince,' who is apparently responsible for the maintenance of the established order of things, but seems to have even less opportunity of initiative than the popes of the middle ages, in the moment of their highest hopes, wished to allow to the 'secular arm'"[1] (CB, p. 29).

Here I must draw attention to the little study of "the King of Deuteronomy xvii.," which appeared in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA for July, 1911, and is reprinted on pages 157–168 of "Pentateuchal Studies." I do not think that the importance of the Septuagintal readings there noted has been at all generally grasped. According to the textual principles I have just quoted from CB, this text must be more original than the Massoretic, for it is easy to understand how it would be altered by scribes in the light of history to what our Hebrew has, but difficult to see how our Hebrew could give us the Greek readings. If this be so, it throws a great deal of light on Ezekiel. It is to the text of Deuteronomy as he knew it that he went for his reform of the monarchy, at any rate to some extent. But that was not all. The monarchy had brought certain abuses in its train, and accordingly Ezekiel lays down for its regulation precepts which are dictated in part by the spirit of the Mosaic legislation and in part by his priestly intensification of holiness. Thus he strongly forbids excessive proximity to the Temple either of a residence or of

[1] On the high priest, see Pentateuchal Studies, p. 275. It is absurd to say that Ezekiel "knows nothing of a high-priest," because he is repeatedly mentioned in the older history and it is no part of the prophet's purpose to mention what does not bear on his immediate object; compare the passage quoted above from CB, p. 288. Lofthouse himself admits this on p. 334: "In spite of Ezekiel's silence on the high-priest (an official who does not seem to be mentioned before Haggai), there was already a chief priest in Jerusalem (cf. 2 Kings xii. 9, xxv. 18)."

a tomb (xliii. 7–9), regarding this as defiling. That was a matter with which, from the nature of the case, Moses could not have dealt by anticipation, even if he had shared Ezekiel's view, which may, of course, be nothing more than part of the ideal element of the vision. Another abuse related to royal dealings with the land. Here Ezekiel makes his object plain in the words "and my princes shall *no more* oppress my people," etc. (xlv. 8). Other precepts are explained by the words "*remove* violence and spoil, and execute judgment and justice; *take away* your exactions from my people" (ver. 9).

With the monarchy there had grown up a series of royal offerings in addition to the national offerings instituted by Numbers xxviii. f. We know very little about them, but 2 Kings xvi. 15 makes their existence quite clear.[1] Perhaps it may be inferred from Ezekiel xlv. 9 ff. that there had been abuses in connection with the amounts of the royal and national offerings. Certainly the prophet seeks to prevent such a possibility in the future, and in addition he lays down regulations (xlv. 21–25, xlvi.) as to the offerings of the prince on certain stated occasions. These provisions have nothing on earth to do with the national offerings commanded by Numbers, which we have already seen in the time of Ahaz. They deal with the royal offerings, "the burnt offerings that the prince shall offer" (xlvi. 4); and in verses 13 f. the Septuagintal reading "he" is to be preferred to "thou." Similarly, in xlv. 22 the new sin offering is to be prepared by the prince "for himself and for all the people of the land." That is because Numbers does not require a sin offering at all at Passover, and Ezekiel, introducing it with his intensification of holiness, makes the one offering do for both prince and

[1] See Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, pp. 201 f.

people: but the burnt offerings, on the other hand, are his and his only (ver. 23 ff.). Here there is no reference to the people of the land, because their burnt offerings are provided by Numbers. Thus it will be seen that these provisions are purely due to circumstances that had arisen since the time of Moses, and accordingly were left untouched by Numbers: that they in no wise supersede or conflict with the provisions of that book; and that such difficulty as has been felt is due partly to misunderstanding and partly to a slight corruption in the Hebrew text. This answers Lofthouse's fourth point:—

"More or less precise details are given in all these codes with reference to the sacrifices to be offered on particular occasions. Not only do these differ, but it will be found in each case that Ezekiel demands rather more than Deuteronomy, and the Priests' code rather more than Ezekiel" (CB, p. 30).

His first argument relates to the distinction between priests and Levites. I need not here repeat what I have said on pages 237 f., 241 f., 278 ff. of "Pentateuchal Studies," in view of the fact that, on being confronted with this in the LQR, Lofthouse was unable to say anything. The fact is particularly noteworthy, because in January he wrote: "That only one house of God existed, served by priests, is disposed of by the provision in Dt. (xviii. 6, cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 9) for the 'dis-established' Levites from the local sanctuaries" (p. 131). In April I answered: "It is equally untrue to say that there is a provision in Dt. (xviii. 6) 'for the "dis-established" Levites from the local sanctuaries.' There is no suggestion whatever in the passage either of 'disestablishment' or of 'local sanctuaries'" (p. 271), and Lofthouse has not attempted to support his earlier statement in the face of this.

His third point is an utter misconception, which, I venture to say, would be impossible to anybody who, like the present

writer, has actual personal experience of what a Day of Atonement is. He writes:—

"Deuteronomy, like the older code, is silent as to any Day of Atonement. The impressive ritual of the annual Day of Atonement in the Priests' code is well known. Ezekiel prescribes two Days of Atonement, one at the beginning of each half-year; but the ceremonial is simple; it resembles that of the Priests' code only in the central idea, viz. that unintentional acts may have violated the holiness which ought to be preserved unspotted in all that pertains to the worship" (CB, pp. 29 f.).

The answer is very simple. The days prescribed by Ezekiel are not Days of Atonement, or anything in any way resembling them. They are rather the equivalent, in the world of ritual, of our homely "spring cleanings." It is only necessary to look at Ezekiel's language to see this (xlv. 18 f.). Who is to keep this day? Nobody. What is to be done on it? The sanctuary is to be unsinned. That is all. But a Day of Atonement is a very different institution, as anybody who reads Leviticus xvi. can see for himself. It is kept by all the people as a sabbath of solemn rest, and they afflict their souls thereon, and atonement is made for them to cleanse them, that they may be clean from all their sins.[1] And if it be asked, Why has Ezekiel two of these cleansings? the answer would seem to be, Partly because of his love of symmetry, but chiefly because the first and seventh months are in fact the two great months of the Jewish year. Pentecost cannot be fitted into any symmetrical scheme in the same way; and, moreover, it lasted only for a single day.

[1] Curiously enough, Lofthouse himself *ad loc.* (CB, p. 334) admits that the ceremony is held "for the ceremonial impurity . . . . caused to the temple (*an idea not found in Lev. xvi.*)" (my italics). Thus the ceremony is on different days from the Day of Atonement, effects a quite different object, and is inspired by a wholly different idea. Therefore to the higher critical mind it constitutes a Day of Atonement!

Those are the four principal points on which Lofthouse relies, and not one of them is seen to be sound once textual criticism is brought to bear in a scientific manner. It should be added that in the same way a true grasp of the historical situation explains minor points; e.g., in xliv. 22, Ezekiel introduces a fresh limitation on the right of marriage of priests. Leviticus xxi. 7 had permitted an ordinary priest to marry none save virgins or widows, " for he is holy unto his God "; while verses 13–15 had limited the high priest to a virgin. But since the days of Moses the priesthood had been shifted to the family of Zadok (Pentateuchal Studies, pp. 271–274). Hence Ezekiel limits all priests to virgins *or widows of priests*. In this way true priestly descent in the male line is to be assured for all priests, for historical experience of the shifting of the high priesthood had shown that the limitation on the marriage of the high priest only was an insufficient protection, seeing that somebody who was not a direct descendant of the last high priest might attain to the dignity. It had further shown that (as in the case of Zadok) descent from any priest of Levitical descent was sufficient, and hence marriage with the widow of a priest is permitted by the prophet.

It may be mentioned that Ezekiel's sacerdotalism shows itself in the position given to the priests as judges (xliv. 24), and that the whole vision is inspired by the fact that the exile and termination of the Temple services meant that a fresh start would have to be made on the return, when of course old practices could come up for reconsideration. Doubtless this inspires much of his architecture as well, even where we cannot trace the details. The foregoing fully answers Lofthouse's questions in CB as to the relation of Ezekiel to P and the need for his work.

There are, however, passages in other earlier writings that refer to "P":—

"Deut. xiv. 4–20 (on clean and unclean animals) is, as Dr. Driver admits, 'in great measure verbally identical' with Lev. xi. 2–23" (Orr, Problem of the Old Testament, p. 314).

In that case what becomes of the argument from style? Here we have something that is "in great measure verbally identical" with a large section of P. So people could write like this some centuries before P was forged!

"The permission to kill and eat flesh at home in Deut. xii. 15, 20 ff., presupposes and modifies (in view of the entrance into Canaan, ver. 20) the stringent law in Lev. xvii. 1–3, that all slaying was to be at the tabernacle door;[1] and the reiterated prohibitions of eating the blood (vers. 16, 23–25) rest on the enactments in P on the same subject (Lev. xvii. 23–25; cf. Gen. ix. 4; Lev. iii. 17; vii. 26, 27, etc.). . . . Deut. xxiv. 8 expressly affirms the existence of a Mosaic law of leprosy given to the priests (cf. Lev. xiii., xiv.)" (*op. cit.*, p. 314).

In the April LQR, I confronted Lofthouse with the testimony of Hosea viii. 11–13 (Origin of the Pentateuch, pp. 131 f.), and he had nothing to say in reply. It is to be remembered that the contents of "P" are to a large extent exceedingly technical, and that there is as little cause to refer to them as there would be for an English poet or historian to deal with the details of civil procedure.[2]

When in difficulty there are one or two things that the critics always say, and the production of these arguments is an infallible sign that they are short of ammunition. Accordingly I was not surprised to find Lofthouse quoting the corrupt Hebrew text of Jeremiah vii. 22 wrenched from its context to prove that Jeremiah cannot have known of P. As a

[1] See on this, especially, "Studies in Biblical Law," pp. 41 f.

[2] Note that Ex. xvi. 4(E) contemplates a law which was not oral or prophetic teaching.

matter of fact the Greek, Latin, and Syriac (see Kittel, Biblia Hebraica, *ad loc.*) read ל only. The natural translation is there, as so often, "on account of, because of." The prophet then says:—

"21 Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Add your burnt offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat ye flesh. 22 For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, for the sake of burnt offerings or sacrifices; 23 but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the way that I commanded you, that it may be well with you. 24 But they hearkened not, nor inclined their ear, but walked in their own counsels and in the stubbornness of their evil heart, and went backward and not forward. 25 Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day, I have sent unto you all my servants the prophets, daily rising up early and sending them: 26 yet they hearkened not unto me, nor inclined their ear, but made their neck stiff: they did worse than their fathers.

"27 And thou shalt speak all these words unto them; but they will not hearken to thee: thou shalt also call unto them; but they will not answer thee. 28 And thou shalt say unto them, This is the nation that hath not hearkened to the voice of the Lord their God, nor received instruction: truth is perished, and is cut off from their mouth.

"29 Cut off thine hair, O Jerusalem, and cast it away and take up a lamentation on the bare heights; for the Lord hath rejected and forsaken the generation of his wrath. 30 For the children of Judah have done that which is evil in my sight, saith the Lord: *they have set their abominations in the house which is called by my name, to defile it.* 31 *And they have built the high places of Topheth, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire;* which I commanded not, neither came it into my mind."

And again:—

"1 At that time, saith the Lord, they shall bring out the bones of the kings of Judah, and the bones of his princes, and the bones of the priests, and the bones of the prophets, and the bones of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, out of their graves: 2 and they shall spread them before *the sun, and the moon, and all the host of heaven, whom they have loved, and whom they have served, and*

after whom they have walked, and whom they have sought, and whom they have worshipped: they shall not be gathered, nor be buried; they shall be for dung upon the face of the earth" (viii. 1 f.).

To anybody who is not willfully blind the argument is clear enough. The people had been false to the cardinal principles of religion. They had defiled the Temple, practiced human sacrifice, and worshiped the whole host of heaven. It was no extenuation of such conduct to urge that certain sacrifices had been offered, for it was not for the sake of sacrificial worship that the law had been given. It was for the recognition of God and obedience to his commands. That is the view of all the prophets. "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" (1 Sam xv. 22). It is only the old lesson of Exodus xv. 25 f., xvi. 4, xix. 5.

I come now to the moral issue. In the April LQR I pointed out that the critics had never dared to answer in detail pages 292–326 of Orr's "Problem of the Old Testament." Lofthouse was necessarily silent on the subject. I therefore quote the following:—

". . . . there can be no evading of the meaning of the transaction. What we have is the deliberate construction of an elaborate Code of laws with the express design of passing it off upon the people in the name of Moses. It is not a sufficient reply to urge that much in the law was simply the codification of pre-exilian usage. A codification of ancient law — if that were all that was meant — even though it involved some degree of re-editing and expansion, is a process to which no one could reasonably take exception, provided it were proved that it had actually taken place. But though this notion is, as we shall see, a good deal played with, the Wellhausen theory is assuredly not fairly represented, when, with a view to turn the edge of an objection, it is spoken of as mainly a work of 'codification.' The very essence of the theory, as Kuenen and Wellhausen expound it, is, that in all that gives the Priestly Code

its distinctive character, it is something entirely new.[1] There never, *e.g.*, existed such an ark or tabernacle as the Code describes with minute precision. The tabernacle is a pure fiction, obtained by halving the dimensions of the temple, and making it portable. There never was a choice of Aaron and his sons to be priests, or a separation of the Levites to be ministers to the priests. There never was a tithe system for the support of priests and Levites; there never were Levitical cities; there never were sin- and trespass-offerings, or a day of atonement, such as the Code prescribes; there never were feasts having the historical origin and reference assigned to them in the law. These institutions were not only not Mosaic, but they never existed at all; and *the constructors of this Code knew it*, for they were themselves the inventors. This cannot be evaded by saying, as is sometimes done, that it was a well-recognised custom to attribute all new legislation to Moses. For first, apart from the singular problem which this raises for the critics who attribute *no* laws to Moses, such a custom simply did not exist;[2] and, second, this is not a case of mere literary convention, but one of serious intention, with a view to gaining a real advantage by the use of the law-giver's authority. The nearest parallel, perhaps, that suggests itself is the promulgation in Europe in the ninth century of our era of the great collection of spurious documents known as the Isidorian Decretals, carrying back the loftiest claims of the mediæval Papacy to apostolic men of the first century. No one hesitates to speak of these spurious decretals, which gained acceptance, and were for long incorporated in the Canon law, by their rightful names of 'forgeries.'[3] Can we help giving

[1] "According to Wellhausen, the Code was not only not in operation, but 'it did not even admit of being carried into effect in the conditions that prevailed previous to the exile.'—*Hist. of Israel*, p. 12. 'The idea that the Priests' Code was extant before the exile,' says Kautzsch, 'could only be maintained on the assumption that no man knew of it, not even the spiritual leaders of the people, such as the priests Jeremiah and Ezekiel.'—*Lit. of O. T.*, p. 116."

[2] "*E.g.*, Ezekiel did not attribute his laws to Moses; the Chronicler did not attribute the elaborate ordinances in 1 Chron. xxiii. to Moses but to David; Ezra and Nehemiah themselves did not attribute their modified arrangements to Moses. Circumcision was not attributed to Moses, etc. We do not know of any laws being attributed to Moses which were not *believed* to be Mosaic."

[3] "Hallam says of these in his *Middle Ages:* 'Upon these spurious decretals was built the great fabric of papal supremacy over the different national Churches; a fabric which has stood after its foundation crumbled beneath it; for no one has pretended to deny,

the same designation to the handiwork of these exilian constructors of a pseudo-Mosaic Code?[1] It is futile to speak, in excuse, of the different standards of literary honesty in those days. It is not overstepping the mark to say . . . . that men like Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Ezra, were as capable of distinguishing between truth and falsehood, as conscious of the sin of deceit, as zealous for the honour of God, as incapable of employing lying lips, or a lying pen . . . . as any of our critics to-day.[2] We simply cannot conceive of these men as entering into such a conspiracy, or taking part in such a fraud, as the Wellhausen theory supposes" (Prob. of O. T., pp. 292–294).

In a footnote on page 73 of Mr. F. Ernest Spencer's "Short Introduction to the Old Testament," the honest opinion of so able and clear-sighted a follower of Reuss as Huxley is quoted: "If Satan had wished to devise the best means of discrediting Revelation, he could not have done better." Wellhausen himself is reported to have said of his teaching as compared with that of some of Lofthouse's leaders: "I knew the Old Testament was a fraud, but I never dreamt, as these Scotch fellows do, of making God a party to the fraud" (Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1912, p. 410). I think that a writer on ethics like Lofthouse would do well to examine these matters carefully for himself, and not be content to quote the opinion that critics who cannot distinguish between a house and a mound hold of their own performances. "Progressive revelation" is a pretty phrase, but it must be remembered that it cannot be stretched to make One Who is eternally the same a party to a fraud. When Lofthouse adds that no proof is given of Mosaic authorship, I refer him to the "Origin of the Pentateuch" and my other books, and

for the last two centuries, that the imposture is too palpable for any but the most ignorant ages to credit' (*Student's Hallam*, p. 295)."

[1] "'Such procedure,' says Riehm, 'would have to be called a fraud.'—*Einleit.* i. p. 217."

[2] "Cf. Jer. viii. 8; xiv. 14; xxiii. 32; Ezek. xiii. 6, 7, 19, etc."

especially to the line of argument suggested on pages 110 f. of the "Origin."

Lastly, Lofthouse urges that Abraham twice induces his wife to play a rather unworthy trick (Gen. xii. 10 ff. and xx. 2). What bearing this is supposed to have on the Mosaic authenticity of the legislation I am at a loss to conceive, but the argument belongs to the same stock as Jeremiah vii. 22 f. Now I have had experience of the critical arguments from doublets, and as the only known way of inducing Lofthouse to read any portions of the "Origin of the Pentateuch" is to quote them, I transcribe the following: "At present the Pentateuch contains two narratives in which Moses draws water from a rock, Ex. xvii. and Num. xx. The critics hold it to be improbable that any author should have told two such stories and therefore proceed to apply their curious methods. The result is startling. In place of one author who writes two such narratives, we double the number and get two (J and E). 'J's traditions,' writes Mr. Carpenter, 'attached parallel incidents to two names, Massah and Meribah. E appears also to have contained explanations of both designations.' In addition, P had a Meribah story. So that we reach the result that when the higher critics desire to divide two by two, their arithmetical labors lead them to believe that the quotient is five — or perhaps six if P had a Rephidim story! Thus do our literary homoeopathists remedy the improbability of having an author who could relate two incidents of lack of water. *Similia similibus curantur!*

"The case is not dissimilar with regard to manna. Num. xi. 4–6 clearly implies that the Israelites had been fed with manna for a lengthy period. Accordingly it becomes necessary to postulate an earlier reference to manna in JE to make up for the loss of Ex. xvi., most of which has gone to P. If

with Mr. Carpenter Ex. xvi. be given to E while the present passage is assigned to J, we shall have at least four manna stories, viz. J two (Num. xi. and its antecedent in the same document); E one (Ex. xvi. 4 and its original context); P one (Ex. xvi., except ver. 4). Moreover, E and P inserted their manna stories at precisely the same point in the narrative, and J's first manna story, being long before Kibroth-hattaavah, must also have come soon after the Exodus.

"It is true that there are two flights of quails; but, as they took place almost exactly a year apart, and as the migration of the quails is in fact annual, there is no reason at all to doubt the narrative" (pp. 98 f.). If, in the light of this, we turn to Genesis, we find, as may be expected, that the critical case breaks down utterly. Both narratives contain the Tetragrammaton. Genesis xx. uses both the words for handmaid; and indeed Lofthouse himself threw this argument overboard in October, 1914, when he wrote: "If we admit (what the 'higher critics' have never denied) that E does not only use 'Jacob' and 'amah' (maid), and J does not only use 'Israel' and 'shiphcah' (maid)' and the like" (p. 337). But it is not true that "the higher critics have never denied" it, as he may see by referring to Skinner's "Genesis" and Carpenter and Harford-Battersby's "Hexateuch" on Genesis xx. 14. If we look at the introductory note on that chapter in the last-named work, we find it admitted that "the affinities of style and thought with J are numerous"; and, on the supposed criteria for its distinction, see BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, January, 1915, p. 146, note, and "Pentateuchal Studies," pp. 74–76. Hence, on examination, there is here no shadow of a case for a documentary theory. That Abraham should have made a practice of passing Sarah off as his sister in cases where the habits of the age made this an expe-

dient measure for self-protection gives no ground whatever for surprise, and not one of the other alleged criteria can stand investigation.

In conclusion, I would express the earnest hope that Lofthouse may at last be induced to make a serious study of the writings of conservatives. Common sense as well as common fairness should warn him that it is wrong to criticize what he has not read, and that persistence in this course is as little likely to advance scholarship as to add to his reputation.