SINCE WELLHAUSEN

A BRIEF SURVEY OF RECENT PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM

BY

JOHN BATTERSBY HARFORD, M.A.

CANON OF RIPON

SINCE
WELLHAUSEN

A BRIEF SURVEY OF
RECENT PENTATEUCHAL
CRITICISM

BY

JOHN BATTERSBY HARFORD, M.A.

CANON OF RIPON

PREFACE

THE Articles, herein contained, were written to answer the question : " Have the main pillars of the modern view of the Pentateuch been seriously shaken ? " They appeared originally in *The Expositor* (July to December, 1925), and are now reprinted, by kind permission of Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, in the belief that they will prove serviceable both to professional students and also to those members of the general Christian public who wish to know how matters stand to-day in the matter of Old Testament criticism.

A few fresh references to recent literature are given under the heading of Addenda, but no attempt has been made to give a complete Bibliography, and otherwise the original Articles have been reprinted practically as they stood.

<div align="right">J. BATTERSBY HARFORD.</div>

THE CRESCENT, RIPON.
January 25, 1926.

NOTE

THE following Editorial note by Professor Moffatt, which appeared in the last number of *The Expositor*, gives his opinion of the value of the Articles.

"The Series of Articles by Canon Battersby Harford has been a real contribution to the subject of Old Testament criticism. I am personally grateful to him for having undertaken the task, and I know, from correspondence, that he has presented many readers with exactly the information they required. The movements of criticism in this department are so vigorous that it seemed to me a critical survey was needed, and the Canon has drawn this accurately as well as freshly. We are all in his debt."

ADDENDA

P. 21. Footnote † *add* and Skinner's Commentary on Genesis, pp. xlii.-xliii.

P. 23. *Add footnote.* For a review of Baumgärtel's monograph from another point of view, see H. M. Wiener in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1915.

P. 73. *Add to footnote* †. Pope has replied to Skinner in *Irish Theological Review* (1915), and H. M. Wiener made further reply in *Bibl. Sacra.*, Jan., 1915.

Pp. 110-11. Dr. Welch has published in the second half-yearly number of the *Z.A.W.* two short articles on "When was the worship of Israel centralized at the Temple?" and on "The Death of Josiah." In the former of the two he puts the insertion of the phrase "the place, or city which Yahweh chose out of all the tribes of Israel to set His name there" into the period *before* the Exile, i.e. within 35 years of Josiah's Reformation.

P. 117. Recent additional publications on Deuteronomy in Germany are

W. Stärk, *Das Problem des Deuteronominus*, 1924.
M. Löhr, *Das Deuteronomium*, 1925 (reviewed by H. M. Wiener in the *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*).

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS OF ARTICLE.

Articles by Professor Welch in the EXPOSITOR, December, 1913, and May, 1923.

The question raised : Have the main pillars of the modern view been shaken ?

The answer to be found in the re-interrogation of the facts.

Note.—The Pentateuch doesn't claim Mosaic authorship.   Sellin's verdict.

Supplementary note on the use of Elohim in the Pentateuch (with special reference to Baumgärtel on Elohim outside the Pentateuch).

Article 1.   A PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION.

IN all departments of scientific research, it is desirable from time to time to pause and take stock of the actual position. In the articles which follow an attempt has been made to survey some of the recent work in the department of Old Testament study and to estimate its worth. Those who know the wide extent of the area which may be included under that head, and therefore of the literature devoted to its investigation, will appreciate the necessity of confining the scope of the present discussion within manageable limits. Those limits are in this case determined by two considerations. In the first place I write

in the interests of those Bible-students who live busy lives and who have little leisure to give to the following of the intricacies of scholarly investigation. Many such have been puzzled by recent categorical assertions that the very bases of the teaching which has been current at our Universities for the last generation or so have been ' seriously shaken,' and they may welcome an attempt to test the real state of the case and to express the result arrived at in, as far as possible, untechnical language.*   In the second place it was an article by Prof. A. C. Welch, published in the EXPOSITOR in May, 1923, under the title, " On the Present Position of Old Testament Criticism," which ultimately led me to take up the task of preparing these articles.   In his article Prof. Welch alludes to many of the problems which are now being keenly debated, and I propose for the most part to confine myself to the issues which he has raised and to follow the order in which he has raised them.   This has the disadvantage that it gives excessive prominence to the discussion over the use of the Divine names, but it has also its advantage.   It concentrates attention on certain definite issues.   Readers of this series of articles are therefore asked to note that the articles are not an independent presentation of the facts upon which our judgment as to the dominant hypothesis must be based. If they were, both proportion and contents would be different.   They simply seek to deal with the actual issues raised by the article of May, 1923.

It will help us better to understand these issues, if we note that this article is the second which Prof. Welch has published under the same title.   The first was published in the EXPOSITOR of December, 1913.   In it the lecturer

* Having in view in the main this type of student, I have as a rule referred to works which have been published in English and which are therefore accessible to all.

criticized the view of the course of Hebrew *history* and of the development of Hebrew *religion*, which had been set forth by " the School which passes under the name of Wellhausen." He sought to emphasize " the distinctive character of Israel's religion " and the antiquity of much of Israel's law and custom. But at the same time he was careful to point out that " the scheme [i.e. " the Wellhausen theory "] in its broad features still holds the field, and even many of its detailed results are proved." " There is, e.g., no serious effort to go back to the position that Deuteronomy in its present form is Mosaic, in the sense of dating from the time of the Exodus. Now that is the crux of the position, for to put Deuteronomy late is to recognize that the law, in the form in which we have the law, comes after instead of before the writing prophets." All that he claims is that the theory " must modify itself and remain supple enough to make room for the new facts and the new light on old facts which are being thrust upon our notice.*

In 1923 the Professor seems to go much further. He now asserts that " the three cardinal positions of modern criticism " have been " seriously shaken." These three positions are stated by him as follows : (i) " the analysis of Genesis and of the Pentateuch into three (*sic*) main sources, which were afterwards combined into one " ; (2) " the book of Deuteronomy, if not in its present, at least in its original, form, was first brought to light in 621 by King Josiah, when it was used as a basis for an effort at reform in the national religion " ; and (3) " Ezra, about 440, pledged the body of returned exiles to a new lawbook, the Priestly

---

* The willingness of scholars to do this is recognized by Prof. Welch in his 1923 article, p. 346, " Modifications in its original statement have been continually made to meet objections." (And this still holds good. It is not a rigid orthodoxy by any means.) It is somewhat perplexing to find side by side with this a description of the theory as " rigid and inelastic " (pp. 369 and 358).

Code, so called because it transformed the people from a civil to an ecclesiastical community, organized under a high-priest instead of under a king."

The chief value of this second article consists in the fact that it presents in summary and readable form a contention, which has been advanced by various writers during the last twenty or twenty-five years, viz. that the current theory of the Pentateuch is in a precarious condition. Premising that the modern view of the Old Testament " has passed from the position of an extreme heresy into that of a new orthodoxy," Prof. Welch proceeds to marshal reasons which have been advanced for questioning the soundness of its dogmas.* It is well that we should be called upon from time to time to examine foundations. We thank him therefore for throwing down this challenge and we take it up, not in the spirit of antagonism, but in the interests of truth. Is it the fact that the main pillars of " the modern view " have been " seriously shaken " ? Are the reasons given strong and broad enough to justify such a statement ? If they are, what better theory has Dr. Welch, or any of the writers whom he quotes, to put in its place ?

Dr. Hort, in his Introduction to *The New Testament in Greek* (vol. ii, p. 323 f.), has well expressed the spirit in which we desire to undertake this quest for truth : " An implicit confidence in all truth, a keen sense of its variety and a deliberate dread of shutting out truth as unknown . . . quench every inclination to guide criticism into delivering such testimony as may be to the supposed advantage of truth already inherited or acquired. Critics of the Bible, if they have been taught by the Bible are unable to forget

---

* This second article was originally an inaugural address at the opening of a New College session. I cannot help thinking that its more provocative statements are due to a desire to awaken certain students from critical slumbers and should not be taken *au grand sérieux.*

that the duty of guileless workmanship is never superseded by any other."

It will be convenient if we consider the matter at issue under Dr. Welch's three heads : A. The Analysis of the Pentateuch. B. The Date of Deuteronomy. C. The Date and Nature of the Priestly Code. The first of these will be considered in the first three articles.

We take then, first :

A. The Literary Analysis of the Pentateuch.

I. *The Problem.*

Let us begin by noting what, broadly speaking, is the Problem to be explained. For there is a Problem. It was not without good reason that Prof. Orr called his well-known book *The Problem of the Old Testament.* On page 8, after giving a long list of men who combined modern critical views with the full belief in supernatural revelation, he writes : " the attitude to criticism of so large a body of believing scholars may at least suggest to those disposed to form hasty judgments that there is here *a very real problem* to be solved ; that the case is more complex than perhaps they had imagined ; that there are *real phenomena* in the literary structure of the Old Testament, for the explanation of which, in the judgment of many able minds, the traditional view is not adequate." What are these " real phenomena " ? We can only indicate in the most summary way a few of them.

1. As long ago as 1680 Father Simon drew attention to the presence in Genesis of duplicate narratives of the same events, e.g. those of the Creation, of the Flood, and of Abram (Abraham) and Sarai (Sarah) (Gen. 12^{10-20} in Egypt, 20^{1-17} in Gerar, cp. Isaac and Rebekah in 26^{6-11}).

2. Seventy years later Astruc, another Frenchman, pointed out that these duplicate narratives were marked

by the use of distinctive names for God. In one set the Divine Name is Elohim (God), in the other it is YHWH (Jehovah or Yahweh, represented in our EV by 'the LORD' or occasionally GOD). In Genesis 2 and 3 the two names are combined : Yahweh Elohim (the LORD God). Yahweh is of course a proper noun, the particular name of the God of Israel. Elohim is used both as a proper name of the one true God (as in Gen. 1^1–2^3, 35 times), and as an appellative, i.e. a common or generic name (as e.g. 'the God of Abraham' and 'the LORD (Heb. Yahweh) thy God'). It is only when used as a proper name that it comes within our purview. The occurrences in the Hebrew text of the two names so defined may be tabulated as follows :—

TABLE I.

	Elohim.	Yahweh.	Yahweh Elohim.	Adonai Y.
Gen. 1^1–Ex. 3^{15}	178*	146†	20	2
Ex. 3^{16}–end .	44	393	1	
Leviticus . .	0	311		
Numbers . .	10	365		
Deuteronomy .	7	548		2
	239	1,763	21	4

The point to be noticed in this Table is the remarkable change which takes place as soon as Ex. 3^{13-15} is reached. How is it to be explained ? That is the Problem in its simplest form. But before attempting to solve it, we must go into greater detail. The following Table sets forth the *distribution* of the names in Genesis and Exodus. It will be observed that in many parts the two names occur (so to speak) in patches,‡ while in others they are intermingled.

---

* For a possible modification of the figures in this column, see the supplementary note at the end of the article.

† This figure (146) includes the Divine Name embedded in the place-name "Jehovah jireh" (Gen. 22^{14}).

‡ Note especially 1^1–2^3, 10^1–17^{1a}, 18^1–19^{28}, 24–27.

The significant fact is that in a number of instances the patches coincide with duplicate narratives.

TABLE II.

Genesis.	E.	Y.	Y.E.	A.Y.
1^1–2^3	. 35	0		
2^4–3^{14}	. 4 (serpent)	0	20	
4 .	. 1	10		
5 .	. 5	1		
6^{1-8}	. 2 (sons of God)	5		
6^{9-22}	. 5	0		
7^{1-5}	. 0	2		
7^6–8^{19}	. 5	1		
8^{20-22}	. 0	3		
9 .	. 7	1		
10–17^{1a}	. 0	35	—	2
$17^{1b\text{-end}}$	. 7	0		
18–19	. 2 (19^{29})	17		
20–23	. 23	9 (20^{16}, $21^{1, 1, 33}$, $22^{11, 14, 14, 15, 16}$)		
24–27	. 2 (25^{11}, 27^{28})	33		
28 .	. 5	4		
29 .	. 0	4		
30 .	. 9	3 (30^{24-30})		
31–35	. 23	3 ($31^{3, 49}$, 32^9)		
36–37	. 0	0		
38–39	. 1 (39^9)	11		
40–50	. 27	1 (49^{18})		
Exodus.				
1–3^{15a}	. 15	3		
	—	—	—	—
	178	146	20	2
	—	—	—	—
3^{15b}–17	. 13	225 (+2 Yah + 1 Yahweh-Nissi)	1	
18–24	. 26	48		1
25–40	. 5	119		1
	—	—	—	—
	44	392	1	2

We note also the use of El eighteen times in such titles as El Elyon, El Shaddai, El-beth-el, El Olam, El-elohe-Israel, and in Gen. 16^{13}, 35^{1-3}, 46^3, 49^{25}.

4. This varied use of the Divine names is not an isolated

phenomenon. Each of the two names is associated with a whole group of phrases and terms and with a characteristic outlook, which mark off the passages in which they occur from the rest. We shall see later that, in the case of the Elohim passages, the accompanying features in different sections vary so much that scholars have long differentiated between two documents, both using Elohim systematically up to Ex. 3^{15} and 6^{2-3} respectively, but in other respects markedly different.*

II. *The Solution Presented by the Dominant Hypothesis.*

What intelligent men require, when their attention has been drawn to such facts as the above, is a theory which will explain them in a reasonable manner. Now a theory has been slowly and laboriously built up in the course of the last 250 years, which has commended itself to an increasing number of scholars, and large agreement upon certain main lines has been arrived at. As far back as 1680 Simon suggested that duplicate narratives in Genesis must be due to two different authors, whose writings had

---

* (a) The use of Elohim in Gen. 1^1–2^{4a} and similar passages is associated with such phrases as " These are the generations of " (2^{4a}, 6^9+8 times and see 5^1); " be fruitful and multiply " ($1^{22, 28}$+9 times); " after their families " (8^{19}+4 times, also Ex. 3 times, Nu. 46, Josh. 31—all in passages assigned to the Priestly document; only elsewhere Nu. 11^{10a} (J), 1 Sam. 10^{21}, 1 Chron. 5^7, $6^{61c.}$ (=Josh. $21^{33, 40}$); etc. [For full list see Driver's *Introduction*, pp. 131 ff.] (b) The use of Yahweh similarly is associated with special phrases : " the angel of Yahweh " (16^7, etc.); " call upon the name of Yahweh " (4^{26}+4 times+Ex. 34^5); comfort (Heb. *nāham*, 5^{29}+6 times ; not elsewhere in Pentateuch in this sense); etc. (c) The second series of passages using Elohim has also its phrases, such as " the angel of Elohim " (21^{17}+3 times+Ex. 14^{19}); ' baal '= owner, husband, citizen, etc. (20^3+16 times in Pentateuch); Horeb (Ex. 3^1+5 times and so Deut. 9 times ; not elsewhere in the Pentateuch); etc. These last two series of passages (generally known as J and E) closely correspond both in contents (from chap. 20) and style, and it would be easy to give a long list of contrasts between the phraseology of ' P ' and of ' J E.' The references in this note are to usages in Genesis only, unless otherwise stated, because it is only in Gen. 1^1–Ex. 3^{15a} and 6^2 that the distinctive use of Elohim is in force.

been put together by Moses. Astruc (1753) suggested that Moses had used various documents, which he arranged in four parallel columns. The two principal documents could be distinguished by their use of Elohim and of Yahweh respectively. The other ten were but fragments, derived probably from the Midianites. All these documents were subsequently amalgamated into one. But an indiscriminate following of the Divine names as the sole clue would have led to confusion, and Eichhorn (1780) carried the theory a stage further by showing that in the large majority of cases the two Divine names were each accompanied by their own style and vocabulary. Working on these lines Ilgen (1798) pointed to duplicate narratives and distinct vocabularies within the Elohistic portion of Genesis. There were in Genesis, he said, two writers who used Elohim only. Geddes, a Scotchman (1792, 1800), and Vater (1802) carried the analysis into the rest of the Hexateuch and regarded the latter as a collection of fragments, which could not be classified into groups. De Wette (1806) compared the institutions described in the Pentateuch with the references to religious usages in Judges, Samuel and Kings, and in a striking chapter of his *Contributions to the Introduction to the Old Testament* took up the question of Deuteronomy. He showed that its favourite phrases and ideals and its formulated laws pointed to an authorship and date different from that of the rest of the Pentateuch, and he assigned it to the seventh century B.C.* Ewald (1843) analysed the Pentateuch into (1) early fragments, including a Book of Covenants ; (2) A Book of Origins, dating from the time of Solomon, which formed the framework (and answered more or less to the modern Priestly code) ; (3) Three prophetic documents (answering to J and E) ; (4) Deuteronomy.

---

* For Deuteronomy see later article.

Hupfeld (*The Sources of Genesis*, 1853), working on the lines of Ilgen, but independently, argued cogently for the existence of two writers using the name Elohim in preference to YHWH, and showed how closely related one of them was to the Yahwist writer, so much so that they were in his opinion combined (= JE) before being attached to P and D. He thus prepared the way for the next step, viz. the dating of the so-called ' Book of Origins ' after, instead of before, Deuteronomy. Reuss (1833), and still more his pupil Graf (1865–6), Kuenen (1861, 1869) and others led in this direction, and Wellhausen (1876, 1878) and Kuenen (1885) argued so powerfully for a post-exilic date for the publication of the Priestly Code, as it came to be called, that their conclusion has come to be accepted by the great bulk of younger scholars from that time onwards. Finally, later research has enriched the documentary theory by recognizing within the four documents incorporated early fragments (e.g. Gen. 6^{1-4}),* early laws and groups of laws,† later additions in the style characteristic of each document ‡ and editorial matter. As the theory involves the work of editors who combined J and E, JE and D, and JED and P, it is obvious that, if the theory be true, additions and modifications due to these men would reveal themselves to the careful student. And such passages can clearly be seen. Some writers, like Mr. H. M. Wiener, make merry over the resort to editors (or ' redactors ') to explain certain phenomena, but, when they come to produce a theory of their

* Prof. Welch (p. 350) speaks of ' the old exploded fragmentary theory.' Is it altogether exploded ? Sir G. A. Smith (*Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, p. 36) writes : " the justness of much of the reasoning connected with this hypothesis has been proved by more recent scholars."

† E.g. Deut. 21^{1-9} (see Carpenter and Harford's edition of the *Hexateuch*, vol. ii, pp. 267–8).

‡ See Carpenter and Harford, vol. i, pp. 141 and foll., and Sir G. A. Smith (as in note *), pp. 41–2.

own, they are obliged to resort to the same explanation (see, e.g., Dahse, p. 18 below, and Wiener, *Contributions to a New Theory*, Bibliotheca Sacra, 1918, pp. 82 ff. ; *Religion of Moses*, p. 19 ; *The Main Problem of Deuteronomy*, p. 4).

The evidence for this analysis and dating of documents was at the outset literary, but in the hands of Wellhausen and other writers, both on the Continent and in Great Britain, it became also increasingly historical. The Pentateuchal laws were compared with the evidence of custom and usage embedded in the historical and prophetical writings. Professor Robertson Smith in his lectures on *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (1881, 1892) brilliantly expounded the theory outlined above and set forth the broad foundations, literary and historical, upon which it was based. He claimed that " in the critical construction of the history the living God is as present as in that to which tradition had wedded us." " Criticism," he went on to say, " unfolds a living and consistent picture of the Old Dispensation ; it is itself a living thing, which plants its foot upon realities and, like Dante among the shades, proves its life by moving what it touches." *

This historical account of the gradual formulation of what Prof. Welch calls " the dominant hypothesis " shows that the theory is no mere mushroom growth. It is the fruit of a prolonged study of the Old Testament, on the part of a long series of able scholars, extending over a period of two centuries and a half. It is a comprehensive effort to

---

* This is probably still the best book for the non-professional man, who wishes to get a clear understanding of the modern view of the Hexateuch or of the Bible. Driver's *Introduction*, Carpenter and Harford's Oxford *Hexateuch* and other books issued during the last thirty years provide for the needs of the professional student. The Oxford University Press has just issued a second edition of Dr. D. C. Simpson's *Pentateuchal Criticism*, a clear and readable setting forth of the arguments in favour of the modern view.

understand the structure of the Hexateuch and affords a most intelligible explanation of the peculiar alternations of the Divine names in Gen. 1^1–Ex. 6^2. If I may put the matter in a nutshell, (a) it found the original clue in Ex. $6^{2, 3}$: "I am YHWH; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as El Shaddai, but by my name YHWH was I not known to them." It went back to Genesis and it found a series of passages in which God appeared as El Shaddai (God Almighty), in which Elohim was consistently used (Gen. 17^1 provides the one exception. Yahweh there may reasonably be regarded as due to a harmonizing editor) and in which the phraseology markedly resembled that in Ex. 6^{2-12}. It has inferred from these passages that parts of Gen.–Ex. are the work of a writer who held that the name YHWH was not known to the Patriarchs and that it was first revealed to Moses. This writer *might* use the name in his own narrative, but he *could not* put it into the mouth of the Patriarchs.* (b) A similar argument, based upon Ex. 3^{13-15} with its context and with corresponding passages in Genesis, has led to the inference that a second writer also held that the Divine Name YHWH was not known until it was revealed to Moses. (c) The existence of numerous passages in Gen. 1^1–Ex. 6^2 in which YHWH is used and is put into the mouths of the Patriarchs is then regarded as pointing to a third writer, who believed that this name was known from the earliest times.

Here we have what seems on the face of it to be a very reasonable explanation of the remarkable change in the use of the Divine names, which takes place just at Ex. 3 and 6. In Theile's edition of the Hebrew Bible Gen. 1^1–Ex. 3^{13} occupies 76 pages; the rest of the Pentateuch

---

* Fuller reasons for this inference will be given at the beginning of the next article (pp. 31–34).

occupies a further 214 pages (the proportion being very nearly 3 to 1). In the first quarter of the whole (290 pages) Elohim by itself and as a proper name is used 178 times, while Yahweh is used 146 times ; in the remaining three-quarters Elohim is used 61 times, while Yahweh is used 1,617 times. It is not that in other respects the special phraseology and ideas of J, E and P disappear ; it is only that, as a rule, all three now use the name Yahweh.* The name ceases to be a mark of difference. The conclusion seems irresistible that in Gen.-Ex. we have three writers, two of whom do not regard the Divine name YHWH as known to the Patriarchs, while the third is of the contrary opinion.

This fusion of documents into one without any overt indication of the fact may seem strange in view of the practice of modern historians, but there are abundant examples of similar proceedings in ancient times. The Saxon Chronicle, the lawbook of Manu, the Diatesseron of Tatian, which weaved the four Gospels into one narrative, the Books of Chronicles in their use of Samuel and Kings and St. Matthew and St. Luke in their use of St. Mark and of ' Q,' exhibit this method.†

III. *The Solution Criticized.*

This " hypothesis," says Dr. Welch, " in the lifetime of us older men has passed from the position of an extreme heresy into that of a new orthodoxy." In other words it has become " the dominant hypothesis." There have,

---

* There is of course nothing theoretically to prevent a writer from continuing to use Elohim after Ex. 3 or 6 and, as a matter of fact, in a few passages Elohim is still used—e.g. Ex. 13[17-20] (4 uses), 18[1, 12-27] (10 in connexion with Jethro), 19-22 (13), 24 (1) and 13 times in the phrases : the angel, the rod (twice), the mount (3), the spirit (2), the finger, the work, the writing, voices (9[28]), of God (see supplementary note). In Numbers 9 out of the 10 occurrences occur in one version of the Balaam story.

† See Carpenter and Harford, *The Hexateuch*, vol. i, pp. 4-13.

however, always been those who have criticized it from the point of view of the older orthodoxy, and within the last twenty-five years there have been others who have attacked it in the interests of a new " heresy."

As an example of the former we may take *The Problem of the Old Testament*, by the late Prof. Orr. It is important to notice that, although written in the interests of the older views, this book by no means repudiates the newer hypothesis root and branch. On page 201 the writer remarks that " in one respect this theory appears to us to mark an advance. In so far as a documentary theory is to be accepted at all—on which after—it is difficult to resist the conviction that P must be regarded as relatively later than JE, for whose narratives, in Genesis at least, it furnishes the ' framework ' and that it is not, as older critics held, a separate older work." Again (pp. 340–1) : " In Genesis P furnishes the systematic framework. . . . In the middle books . . . JE and P appear as co-ordinate. . . . In Joshua . . . the priestly parts appear as supplementary or filling in." Finally (pp. 375–6) he uses " the term ' collaboration ' to express the kind and manner of the activity which in our view brought the Pentateuchal books into their present shape . . . as indicating the labour of original composers, working with a common aim and towards a common end. . . . It may very well be . . . that (1) the original JEP history and code embraced, not simply the Book of the Covenant, but a brief summary of the Levitical ordinances . . .; possibly also a short narrative of the last discourses of Moses and of his death. (2) Deuteronomy, in its original form, was probably an independent work ; (3) the priestly laws also would be at first chiefly in the hands of the priests. (4) Later, but still in our opinion early—not later than the days of the undivided Kingdom—the original work would be enlarged by

union with Deuteronomy and by incorporation of the larger mass of Levitical material. (5) In some such way, with possible revision by Ezra, or whoever else gave the work its final canonical shape, our present Pentateuch may have arisen."* He goes on to suggest that only selected portions would be copied out for general use and that the detailed Levitical code would be left to the Priests. Moreover " the versions in circulation would have their vicissitudes ; would undergo the usual textual corruptions ; may have received unauthorized modifications or additions ; may have had their Jehovistic and Elohistic recensions." This is not the dominant theory, but also it is not by any means the traditional view of older days.

Examples of the newer theories, which certain Continental critics of the dominant hypothesis would substitute for it, may be given in briefer form. The Dutch scholar Eerdmans would analyse the Pentateuch into (1) a Book of Adam, beginning at Gen. 5^1, by a writer with polytheistic views, who amongst other characteristics uses the name Jacob for the third Patriarch ; (2) an enlargement by an editor, who was also polytheistic and who preferred the name Israel to that of Jacob ; (3) a new edition in a monotheistic interest after the discovery of the Book of the Law about 621 B.C. ; (4) a final expansion in the post-exilic period.† Johannes Dahse, a German pastor, now in the Ruhr, a LXX scholar, has been hailed by some as one who supports the reaction towards the older views which they would fain see brought about. He certainly criticizes the dominant theory, but it is questionable whether his own theory is much more palatable from the traditional point

* I have added the numbering (1) to (5) in order to bring out clearly the successive stages through which, in Prof. Orr's opinion, the Pentateuch probably passed.

† See Sellin's *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1923), p. 31.

of view. Starting from (1) an original document, chiefly narrative, Dahse postulates (2) Prophetic Editors, one, two or more ; (3) a Liturgical Editor (whom he identifies with Ezra), who divided the book into sections for reading in public worship and introduced editorial matter, consisting of recapitulations, tables, anticipations, which largely coincide with passages assigned by most scholars to P ; and (4) a Theological Editor or Editors, who took the text as it left the hands of Ezra (best represented by the LXX text) and transformed it into the present Massoretic Hebrew text.*

In succeeding articles I propose to take up one by one the criticisms made upon " the dominant hypothesis." Let me conclude this preliminary article by two quotations from Sellin's *Introduction*.

(1) " The Torah or Pentateuch . . . bears no superscription or signature indicating Moses as the author. He is for the most part spoken of in the third person, and it is expressly said that only some of the most important historical, and in particular the legislative, portions are from his hand." †

(2) " While all theories as to the number, origin and age of the different sources are only working hypotheses,

* See *A Fresh Investigation into the Sources of Genesis*, translated from the German of Johannes Dahse and published by the S.P.C.K., 1914 ; see also Sellin's *Introduction*, p. 27.

† See Exod. 17^{14}, 24^4, 34^{27} ; Nu. 33^2 ; Deut. $31^{9-13,}$ ^{22,} $^{24-26}$. Genesis and Leviticus contain no allusions to the writing of them, and even Deuteronomy ($1^{1, 3, 5}$, $4^{41, 44}$, 5^1) speaks of Moses in the third person. In the light of these facts, what are we to make of the following statement by Prof. Mackay in his Introduction to Dr. Naville's *The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch*, p. xvii : " It comes to us professing, expressly in four-fifths, and by implication in five-fifths, of its contents, to be of Mosaic authorship " ? I believe that what the writer meant was that, taking, e.g., Lev. 1^1, 4^1,etc., ' at their face value,' a large part of the material of Leviticus must have come from Moses, because " only Moses heard the LORD speak to him." But that is *not* ' authorship ' and such loose statements as the above destroy one's confidence in those that make them. The articles that follow will show why the vast majority of scholars cannot take such phrases as Lev. 1^1 ' at their face value.'

scientifically justified as such, the one absolutely established scientific fact which emerges is that the Pentateuch grew up in the post-Mosaic period out of the combination of several sources which were written in Palestine. That is the immovable basis on which Protestant Pentateuchal criticism unanimously takes its stand at the present day " (p. 29).

Supplementary Note.

On the Use of Elohim in the Pentateuch.

In 1912 F. Baumgärtel published a monograph entitled *Elohim ausserhalb des Pentateuchs*, i.e. Elohim outside the Pentateuch. This monograph is very much *ad rem* in the present discussion, and many may be glad to have their attention directed to it.

Baumgärtel begins his thesis with a survey of recent writings by Dahse and others, which in one way and another threw doubt upon the soundness of the Massoretic text and the reliability of the Names of God in the Pentateuch as a basis for a critical analysis into documents. ' I become more convinced every day,' he writes, ' that the question thus raised cannot be settled by the handling of the Names of God merely within the Pentateuch. We must make a survey of the usage of each of the other books of the Old Testament and get a history of the usage outside the Pentateuch. We can then deal better with the usage within the Pentateuch. Not that the usage outside necessarily holds good within, but that, if we get the whole usage as to the Names of God before our eyes, we shall see the Pentateuchal usage in proper perspective.' Baumgärtel therefore passes under review the whole of the uses of Elohim outside the Pentateuch as a necessary ' preliminary investigation.'

We are here and now concerned only with the methods

which he uses in determining the usage of the different writers, and their bearing upon the usage within the Pentateuch. The important bearing of all this upon the question of the reliability of the Massoretic text will be set forth in Article 3, Part III.

He starts from the position which was taken up at the beginning of this article that only when Elohim is used as a Proper Noun is it significant as a possible sign of authorship. He then sets to work to separate the uses of Elohim which are appellative from the rest. He analyses the uses, and points out that Elohim in various connexions seems to have an appellative significance (i.e. a common or generic force).

He classifies the uses which he regards as appellative under the following heads :—

I. Elohim regarded as appellative on internal grounds.

1. Where it can only have this force, e.g. Yahweh, he is God ; Your God ; etc. This is far the largest class.

2. Stands for the Deity generally, e.g. The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God (Ps. 14 [1,2,5]).

3. In antithesis to man, e.g. Will a man rob God ? (Mal. 3[8]).

4. In general statements, e.g. shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil ? (Job 2[10] ; cp. 2 Sa. 23[3]).

5. Meaning ' superhuman,' e.g. an exceeding great city (Jonah 3[3], cp. 1 Sa. 14[15] ; cp. Acts 7[20]).

6. Where it cannot be equivalent to Yahweh, e.g. the sons of God (Job 1[6], 2[1] ; cp. 1 Sa. 28[13]).

7. In connexion with non-Israelites, e.g. Judg. 3[20], 1[7], etc.

8. Almost equivalent to the sanctuary, e.g. 1 Sa. 14[36], 2 Sa. 12[16].

II. Elohim regarded as appellative on external grounds —i.e. when a certain word stands only with E and not with

Y, or in clearly otherwise Y passages, e.g. man of God (Josh. 14⁶, etc.), ark of God, etc.

III. Elohim in certain phrases.

E.g. 'So may God do to me and more also' (1 Sa. 3¹⁷, etc.) ; 'as the angel of God' (1 Sa. 29⁹ + 4 times) ; contrast 'the angel of Yahweh' in Judges 19 times ; and in other books 21 times.

IV. In other places—a nondescript group of possible appellatives.

V. In Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.

By the application of his methods Baumgärtel reduces the number of uses of Elohim as a Proper Name *outside* the Pentateuch to very small proportions, e.g. in Josh., Jer., Ezek., 11 Minor Prophets, Prov., Ru., Lam., Ezra he finds no such uses. In the Pss. outside the Elohistic Pss. he finds only 4. In Judg. he finds 11, Sam. 6, Kings 5, Isa. 1, Jonah 8, Job 1, Neh. 5, and Chron. 48, and he is doubtful whether all of these are Proper names.

In my judgment Baumgärtel goes too far. He finds an Appellative force sometimes where the evidence does not warrant any such conclusion. There is, however, only one class of cases, which we need discuss at any length, viz. his groups II and III. Our author points out that in certain books, especially the historical books, Judges to Kings, phrases with Elohim (man of God, altar of God, etc.) are used by writers who as a rule use Yahweh as the Divine Name, and he suggests that these phrases had been inherited from pre-Mosaic days, or picked up from non-Israelite peoples in Canaan, and that, being rooted in the popular mind and speech, they were used 'without prejudice' by the prophetic writers of history. If on the lips of Canaanites Elohim had a polytheistic sense, that sense had dropped away by the time that Samuel and Kings were written. The usage in the historical books is thus reason-

ably explained, but it does not follow that in these stereo-typed phrases Elohim is therefore not equivalent to Yahweh. On the contrary, it seems reasonable to say that in using the popular phrases the writers did understand Elohim as equivalent to Yahweh. If in the phrase 'the angel of Yahweh' (17 times in the Pentateuch, 40 times outside) Yahweh is a proper name, there can be no reason why in the parallel phrase (5 times in Gen.–Ex., 7 times in Judges) Elohim should not also have been used by the writers as a proper name. But what does follow is this : that these phrases with Elohim, which lingered long in the popular speech and which were used by writers who otherwise always used Yahweh, cannot be appealed to as decisively indicating an Elohistic author. On the other hand, where they occur in an Elohistic context, it can be fairly said that they fit in with the view that the passage is by a writer of that kind.

Let us now apply these principles of Baumgärtel to the use of Elohim within the Pentateuch. The total uses, classified as far as possible under Baumgärtel's catagories, may be tabulated as on the following page.

The following general conclusions seem legitimate deductions from the results attained by means of this investigation.

1. The immense preponderance of proper-noun uses of Elohim in Gen. 1^1–Ex. 3^{15} over those in the remaining books of the Pentateuch retains all the significance which we have claimed for it in the article, and indeed acquires even greater significance. If we accept all possible deductions of Baumgärtel's lines, we find 145 proper-noun uses before Ex. 3^{16} to 22 after (i.e. $6\frac{2}{3}$ to 1) instead of 178 to 63 (i.e. a little under 3 to 1), more than twice the proportion !

2. We need not, however, go so far as that. The Table shows 73 possible appellative uses in Gen. 1^1–Ex. 3^{15} against 145 clearly proper-noun uses. Of these 73, 40 are unmis-

TABLE OF USES OF ELOHIM IN THE PENTATEUCH.

	Gen.-Ex. 3¹⁵.	Ex. 3¹⁶-end.	Lev.	Num.	Deut.	Total.
A. Appellative on internal grounds.						
1. Unmistakable cases—						
i. Of the true God .	36	52	52	14	325	479
ii. Of other Gods . .	4	20	1	3	37	65
	40	72	53	17	362	544
2. Possible cases—						
i. On internal grounds :						
(a) The Deity generally * . . .	0	4	0	1	1	6
(b) In contrast to man †	6	0	0	0	3	9
(c) Supremely mighty ‡	3	1	0	0	0	4
(d) In converse with non-Israelites §	15	7	0	2	0	24
(e) Equivalent to The Sanctuary ‖ .	0	4	0	0	0	4
ii. On external grounds : Expressions such as 'angel,' etc., of God, esp. if in a Yahwistic context ¶	9	12	0	1	3	25
	33	28	0	4	7	72
Add A 1.	40	72	53	17	362	544
Total of A 1 and 2.	73	100	53	21	369	616
B. As Proper name, equivalent to Yahweh	145	16	0	6	0	167
Total occurrences of Elohim .	218	116	53	27	369	783

* (A 2 i (a) = Baumgärtel I. 2.) Under this heading are included such passages as Ex. 4¹⁶, 'thou [Moses] shalt be to him [Aaron] as God,' and 7¹ 'I have made thee a God to Pharaoh.' Ex. 21¹³ is an interesting example. Elohim might here be translated 'Providence.' If a man does not intentionally direct the blow, 'its direction must be attributed to the Superhuman Power.' Elohim is distinguished from the Divine Lawgiver, Who says : 'I will appoint thee a place whither he shall flee.' See also Ex. 22²⁸, Nu. 21⁵, Deut. 25¹⁸.

† (A 2 i (b) = Baumgärtel I. 3.) In Gen. 6², ⁴ 'the sons of God' in contradistinction to 'the daughters of men' is no doubt a phrase taken from the ancient story, and Elohim is not here equivalent to Yahweh. In 9¹⁶ Elohim, where we might have expected 'me,' is due to the con-

takably appellatives and have always been regarded as
such. The 15 uses in converse with non-Israelites have
not been appealed to by careful scholars as proofs of an
Elohistic writer, but they are not therefore necessarily
appellative. I do not think that in any of the 9 expressions
in A 2 ii Elohim is really appellative, unless it be in Gen.
20[11], which might come under A 2 i (a), as it is spoken in

trast with 'every living creature' (the LXX, as we might expect, gives
the easier reading). In Gen. 32[28] the antithesis of God and man is marked
and verse 30 must be read in conjunction with verse 24, 'a man.' Com-
pare Hos. 12[4], where Jacob's antagonist is called 'the angel.' It is not
Yahweh Himself. In Gen. 33[10] the phrase 'as one seeth the face of God'
is a similar use and is probably taken over from primitive usage in the
popular speech. See also Deut. 1[17], 4[32], 5[20].

‡ (A 2 i (c) = Baumgärtel I. 5.) Gen. 23[6] 'a mighty prince,' 30[8]
'mighty wrestlings,' 35[5] 'a great terror'; Ex. 9[28] 'mighty thunderings.'
See RV in all four passages.

§ (A 2 i (d) = Baumgärtel I. 7.) These are for the most part obvious,
but it may be noted that in including Gen. 3[5] I follow RV text 'as
God' rather than RV marg. 'as gods.' The other passages are Gen.
3[1, 3, 5], 21[22, 23], 39[9], 40[8], 41 (7 times); Ex. 18 (7 times); Nu. 22[38], 23[27].

‖ (A 2 i (e) = Baumgärtel I. 8.) Ex. 21[6], 22[8, 9, 9] RVt. 'God,'
RVm. and AV 'the judges.' This latter rendering takes it that certain
men, Levitical priests or judges, were called Elohim, as representatives
of the Deity at the holy place or sanctuary, or as reflecting the divine
majesty and glory. The former implies that people came to the sanctuary,
because God dwelt there and spoke to them through His representatives.
The practical meaning is the same in either case. Baumgärtel takes
'God' in these phrases as = the Sanctuary.

¶ (A 2 ii = Baumgärtel II.) Gen. 20[11] the fear, 21[17] and 31[11] the
angel, 28[12] and 32[1] and Ex. 14[19] the angels, 28[17] and [22] the house, 32[2]
the host; Ex. 3[1] and 4[27], 18[5], 24[13] the mount, 4[20] and 17[9] the rod, 8[19]
and 31[18] and Deut. 9[10] the finger, 31[3] and 35[31] and Nu. 24[2] the spirit,
32[16] the work, 16[5] the writing, Deut. 21[23] the curse, 33[1] the man, of God.
I have already discussed this type of expression in connexion with Baum-
gärtel's Group II. Probably the great majority, if not all, of them belong
to my Group B, i.e. in the mind of the writer who uses these popular expres-
sions, they meant exactly the same as if he had said : 'the angel, etc., of
Yahweh.' In almost every case they appear in Elohistic contexts, where
in any case we might expect Elohim to be used, but in e.g. 28[12, 17, 22]
they appear in 'a Yahwistic' passage. (Yahweh may be the right reading
in ver. 20. See Skinner's *Divine Names*, p. 42.) Gen. 1[2] 'the Spirit of
God' has not been included. Elohim here cannot be treated as having
a more general meaning than in the other 34 occurrences in this passage.
None of the 'phrases' referred to by Baumgärtel in his Group III occur
in the Pentateuch.

reference to non-Israelites. That leaves only 9 (or 10) probable deductions from my original 178, viz. those grouped under A 2 i (*b*) and (*c*).

3. It is important to note that in Baumgärtel's opinion his investigation strengthens the evidence for the trust-worthiness of the Massoretic text in regard to the use of the Divine names throughout the Old Testament, but this point will come up for discussion in Article 3, Part III, and a mere mention is enough here.

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS.

Recent criticisms of the documentary hypothesis.

I. Ex. 6³—a central position.
    1. Part of a passage full of characteristic phrases linking it to other passages.
    2. Five specially important words and phrases.
    3. Conclusion. Ex. 6³⁻¹² is one of a series of related passages.

II. Attempts to discredit the prima facie meaning of Ex. 6³.
    1. Naville : his incorrect paraphrase ; his misunderstanding of the critical position.
    2. Dahse and Wiener : ἐδήλωσα ; ' Yahweh not used in self revelations ' ; theory as to self-use of Name.
    3. Dahse rewrites the verse with the help of the LXX ; eliminates El Shaddai both from Ex. 6³ and from Genesis (except in 49²⁵) ; and does the same with Yahweh in Ex. 6³.

III. Attempts to discredit the whole analysis, based on the Divine Names.
    1. The basis. Not the Divine Names only ; broader foundation employing other criteria.
        Objections to these as (a) subjective ; (b) often failing to give any sure result. Answers.
    2. Möller, W. H. Green, etc. : significance of the Divine Names. Baumgärtel's position.

Article 2.   RECENT CRITICISM, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE
TO EXODUS 6²⁻³.

IN our first article we saw that certain scholars had in the last twenty-five years called in question the soundness of the current theory of the composition and age of the component parts of the Pentateuch, and we prepared the way for an examination of the arguments they adduced by reminding ourselves of

(1) The Problem presented by the Pentateuch as it stands ;

(2) The Solution set forth by the current documentary theory; and

(3) Some specimens of the alternative theories.

We are now in a position to take up, one after the other, the above-mentioned criticisms and to seek to arrive at a just estimate of their worth.

I. *Exodus* 6$^{2-3}$: *its prima facie meaning and its context.*

It will be quite clear from what we have already seen that Ex. 6$^{2-3}$ with its context is, so far as the use of the Divine Names is concerned, a central position of the documentary theory. Unless the prima facie meaning of that passage can be proved to be wrong, the existence of at least two documents in Genesis, one of which uses the name Yahweh and the other does not, must be regarded as beyond question. Accordingly attempts to set aside that meaning have been made by dissentient critics on various lines. In order to estimate their strength, we must first make a careful study of the passage in question.

1. We note that it does not stand alone. It forms part of a longer passage of eleven verses (verses 2–12), which is full of characteristic phrases that link it on to other passages of a similar type. If anyone will take the trouble to look up the occurrences of the following phrases : ' established my covenant,' ' land of Canaan,' ' land of their sojourn-ings,' ' remembered my covenant,' ' redeem ' (Heb. gā'al, ctr. pādāh in Dt.), ' judgments,' ' be to you a God,' ' spake unto—saying,' they will see that this passage has affinity with Gen. 6$^{9-22}$, 9$^{1-17}$, 17, 23, etc., and that some of these phrases are found also in Ezekiel.

2. In addition to the above, there are five words and phrases in Ex. 6$^{2-3}$ which deserve special attention.

(*a*) ' I ' (Heb. 'ănĭ). In Hebrew two parallel forms of the personal pronoun, first person singular, ('ănĭ and 'ānōkĭ)

maintained their position for a time side by side, but a growing preference for the shorter form is to be seen in the later writings. This may be shown in tabular form as follows :

Book.				'ani.	'anoki.
1 and 2 Samuel	.	.		50	50
Jeremiah	.	.	.	54	37
Ezekiel	.	.	.	138	1
Lam., Hag., Ezr., Est., Eccl.				45	0
Chronicles .	.	.	.	30	1 (1 Chr. 17^1 from 2 Sam. 7^2)
Daniel	.	.	.	23	1 (10^{11})

In Deut. with its rhetorical style 'anoki is habitually used.

It would appear significant that in the passages in Gen.-Numb. assigned by the dominant hypothesis to JE the proportion is—

$$\begin{array}{cc} \text{'ani} & \text{'anoki} \\ 48 & 81 \end{array}$$

while in the P passages it is   130   1 (Gen. 23^4).

In Ex. 6^{2-12} 'ani is used 6 times, 4 times in the phrase, ' I am Yahweh,' once in verse 5, ' I have heard,' once in verse 12, ' I am of uncircumcised lips.'

(b) ' I am Yahweh ' ('ani YHWH) in Ex. $6^{2, 6, 8, 29}$ and $12^{12,}$ Nu. $3^{31, 41, 45}$. Lev. 18–26 (20 times).

The phrase also occurs with amplifications as follows :

' I am Yahweh your God ' (Lev. 11^{44}).

' I am Yahweh that brought you up out of the land of Egypt' (Lev. 11^{45}).

' shall know that I am Yahweh ' (Ex. 7^5, $14^{4, 18}$).

' shall know that I am Yahweh your God ' (Ex. 16^{12}).

' shall know that I am Yahweh your God that bringeth you (brought them) out from . . .' (Ex. 6^7, 29^{46}).

' May know that I am Yahweh which sanctifieth you ' (Ex. 31^{13}).

All these uses occur in sections assigned by the current theory to P. ' I ('ani) am Yahweh ' also occurs in Gen. 15^7 (a passage which shows many signs of being composite)

and 28[13]. Compare ' 'anoki Yahweh ' in Ex. 20[2,5] (? from the parallel passage, Dt. 5[6,9]), Hos. 12[10 (0)], 13[4], Ps. 81[11 (10)], Isa. 43[11], 44[24] (51[12]). The formula ' know that I am Yahweh ' occurs rarely outside definite P sections (Ex. 7[17], 8[18 (22)], 10[2], Dt. 29[5(6)], 1 Ki. 20[13, 28]) until suddenly we find it brought into constant use by Ezekiel (62 times).

(c) ' And I *appeared* unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as El Shaddai ' (EV God Almighty), cp.

Gen. 17[1] : 'and Yahweh *appeared* unto Abraham and said unto him : I am El Shaddai.'

35[9, 11] : 'and Elohim *appeared* unto Jacob, . . . and Elohim said unto him : I am El Shaddai.'

48[3] : 'Jacob said unto Joseph : El Shaddai *appeared* unto me in Luz.' The verb is in the Niphal mood, which has primarily a reflexive force, but ' equally characteristic is its frequent use . . . to express actions which the subject allows to happen to himself ' (Gesenius-Kautzsch. § 51, c). In the above passages God is said to ' allow Himself to be seen.' The force of this particular verb, when in the Niphal mood, is well seen in 1 Ki. 18[1] : ' Go, shew thyself unto Ahab ' (see further under (e)).

(d) El Shaddai, see the passages quoted under (c). See also 28[3], 43[14], 49[25] (El should clearly be read here [instead of ' eth,' the Heb. sign of the object] as do Samaritan, LXX, Syr., Targum of Jonathan, Saad., 4 Heb. MSS.). In 49[25] the title occurs in what is obviously an early poem. In the other passages it seems to be used as an archaic title, no longer in colloquial use. It only occurs once again in the Old Testament. It is significant that this once is in Ezekiel (10[5]).*

* Shaddai without El occurs in an early poem (Nu. 24[4, 16] Balaam) and in later literature in Ruth 1[20, 21], Ps. 68[15 (14)], 91[1], Joel 1[15] (= Is. 13[6]), Ezek. 1[24], and 31 times in Job (5[17], etc.). Neither the Greek translators nor any others seem to have had any real clue to its meaning. In the Pentateuch the LXX translates El Shaddai by ὁ θεός with a possessive pronoun. In Ezek. 10[5] Shaddai is transliterated. In 14 Job passages it is translated

C

(e) ' But by (or ' as to ') my name YHWH I was not known to them.' The verb is in the Niphal and has the same force as the corresponding verb in (c). It should be translated : ' I did not make myself known to them.' This force of the same verb in the Niphal is clearly seen in Ruth 3[3], ' make not thyself known; unto the man.' There are four significant parallel uses of the same verb in the same mood in Ezekiel.

Ez. 20[5]: ' In the day when I chose Israel . . . and *made myself known unto them* in the land of Egypt, when I lifted up mine hand unto them, saying, I am Yahweh your God ; in that day I lifted up mine hand unto them, to bring them forth out of the land of Egypt. . . .'

20[9]: ' . . . the nations (AV the heathen) in whose sight *I made myself known unto them* in bringing them forth. . . .'

35[11]: ' I will do according to mine anger . . . and *I will make myself known* among them [i.e. the children of Israel], when I have judged thee [i.e. Edom].'

38[23]: ' And I will magnify myself . . . and *I will make myself known* in the eyes of many nations and they shall know that I am Yahweh.'

In the first two of the above passages Ezekiel, like the writer of Ex. 6[2,3], looks back to the time just before the Exodus as the time when the God of Israel ' made himself known to them ' by a new name and by an accompanying manifestation of his power.

3. In view of the above stylistic phenomena it would seem an eminently reasonable conclusion that Ex. 6[2-12] forms part of a series of passages, which hang together and which among other peculiarities avoid up to this point the use of the name Yahweh.

παντοκράτωρ (Almighty). Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, and sometimes LXX (Ruth) translated by ἱκανός in accordance with the Rabbinic explanation of Shaddai as compounded of Shĕ and dai (as if = self-sufficient), an explanation not accepted by any modern scholars.

II. *Efforts to explain away the prima facie meaning.*

1. M. Naville, in *The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch* (English Translation by J. R. Mackay, 1923), gives the following as his rendering of Ex. 6[3] : ' I revealed myself to the fathers as their own God, but I did not make known to them that I am Jahveh ' (p. 69).* ' Their own God ' he takes from the LXX ; the second part of the rendering is an incorrect paraphrase, not a translation. M. Naville expands this into ' I said to Abraham, I am Jahveh, that brought thee forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, in order to give thee this land † ; but I did not make known to him what this expression, I am Jahveh, means, for my promise was not yet fulfilled, and I have not even yet manifested to the Israelites by my acts that I am Jahveh ' ; and again, ' Thus the Israelites should know Jahveh, not at all by his saying to them : My proper name is Jahveh, but by his acts. I am Jahveh *means* I am the God that manifests Himself, that maketh Himself known by His acts, of which some are acts of judgment and others acts of mercy.' ‡ In other words M. Naville says that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did know the proper name Jahveh, but they did not know its meaning ; that was only known, when He shewed His judgments upon Pharaoh and His mercies upon Israel. A number of passages, in which the phrase ' Ye shall know that I am Jahveh ' occurs, are quoted to shew that to ' know ' Jahveh means to experience His power (see quotations in I. 2 (*b*)).

If we want to know what M. Naville would have liked the writer of Ex. 6 to have written, this is excellent ; but if we want to know what that writer really did say, it is

* In dealing with M. Naville I, like his translator (pp. 69–70), use the French form of the Divine Name.

† This is a reference to Gen. 15[7].

‡ (pp. 69–70). If ' I am Jahveh ' means this in Ex. 6[2], why did it not mean the same in Gen. 15[7] ?

most misleading. 'I am Jahveh and I appeared unto Abraham . . . as El Shaddai, but by *my name* Jahveh I did not make myself known unto them ' can only mean one thing. To know anyone by his name is one thing ; to know his nature and power is another. To know by experience the power and grace of Jahveh is an infinitely greater thing than to know the mere name Jahveh, but that does not justify us in quietly substituting one for the other and saying that the Biblical writer really meant the one although he said the other. Of course in many passages the know- ledge of experience is promised and set forth, but in this particular passage a prior knowledge is referred to. The God of the Patriarchs was going to manifest His power on behalf of His people and, as a token and pledge of this new display of power, He here and now made Himself known by a new name. Hitherto He had spoken of Himself as El Shaddai ; now and henceforth He is to be known as Jahveh.

M. Naville as a matter of fact completely misunderstands the theory which he is criticizing. According to him ' the critics,' as he calls them, assert (*a*) that one writer (J) believed and wrote ' that Jahveh from the beginning was wor- shipped under that name and that Abraham entered into covenant with Jahveh and received the promises. Jahveh was the national God of Israel, because first He was the God of their forefather Abraham.

(*b*) That another writer (P) denies all this. Abraham never did enter into covenant with Jahveh. Jahveh was not the God of Abraham. He could not be, because Jahveh was not known before Moses (pp. 77–79). ' The Critics,' it is surely hardly necessary to say, assert nothing so foolish. J and P, in their view, are absolutely at one in believing that the God of Israel is the very same God as Abraham worshipped, with whom he entered into covenant and

who promised him the land of Canaan. There is no differ-
ence whatever between them on that point. That upon
which they do differ is simply as to the *Name* by which
God was known to Abraham. J regards the name Jahveh
as known from the beginning. P thinks that God appeared
to Abraham as El Shaddai and that He did not make Him-
self known as Jahveh until He revealed that name to
Moses. It would never have occurred to the priestly
writer that anyone could imagine that he thought of El
Shaddai and Jahveh as different Gods. They were to him
only two different names for one and the same God. The
covenant was with the One God, whatever the actual name
by which He was called. His great point was that the God
of Abraham in the days of Moses manifested His power in
a very wonderful new way and that, as a token and pledge
of this new departure, He revealed Himself under a new
name. This idea is not confined to Ex. 6. We have already
seen that it runs implicitly in a whole series of passages in
Genesis in which El Shaddai and Elohim are used and Jahveh
is not used (for Jahveh in 17^1 see p. 15 in July number).
The facts are too clear to be got rid of on M. Naville's lines.
I think I have said enough to shew (1) that Mr. Naville
does not understand ' the Critics ' and (2) that he has
failed to explain away the plain meaning of Ex. 6.*

2. A second attempt to get away from the prima facie
meaning of Ex. 6^{2-3} is adopted by J. Dahse in Germany
and H. M. Wiener in England.† They point out in the
first place that the LXX translates nōda'ti (AV and RV
I was known) by ἐδήλωσα. That, they say, indicates that
the translators read hoda'ti (the causative mood instead of

---

* There is much else that might be said about M. Naville's views and
theories, but I am obliged to confine myself here to the one point as to
the true interpretation of the passage in Ex. 6.

† J. Dahse, *Textkritische Materialen zur Hexateuchfrage*, I. H. M. Wiener,
Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. Elliot Stock, 1912.

the Niphal mood) with the meaning : ' I made known ' (my name). Even if they did, it does not follow that their reading is the right one.* But it is not clear that they did. As we have seen (I 2 (c) and (e)) the Niphal mood has the force, ' I did not make myself known ' (and so RVm.). No change of reading is therefore necessary and the parallelism with the other verb in the same sentence is in favour of the Niphal form. The exact form of the verb is not however of any importance. What is of importance is whether the interpretation put upon the word by these two writers is the right one or not. They would restrict the meaning to self-revelations. The name Yahweh, they say, was known to, and used by, the Patriarchs, but Yahweh did not use it Himself in revelations. It is true that in Gen. 15[7] and 28[13] the Hebrew text asserts that He did, but this they would set aside on the ground that the LXX in 15[7] reads ὁ θεός and in 28[13] omits Yahweh altogether.† But what difference is there between the use of the name in self-revelations and the use of it on the lips of men? Mr. Wiener answers ‡ that (1) a number of Old Testament passages shew that the Israelites regarded the Divine Name as having *an objective existence* of its own.§ (2) Sir J. G. Frazer and others have recorded the intense aversion of ' many savages ' to uttering their own name, though they have no objection to being accosted by it or even to its being divulged to a stranger by a third person. Among early Hebrews similar ideas prevailed.‖ So in Ex. 3[14], in

---

* The Samaritan Pentateuch, one of the Targums, and all known Heb. MSS. but one, support the Masoretic text. The value of the LXX as an authority for the determination of the original Hebrew text will be considered in Article 3, Parts II and III.

† ADEM 15 cursives and 1 Egyptian version omit, but 12 cursives and 4 versions, including the Old Latin, agree with the Hebrew text.

‡ *Essays*, pp. 45–56.

§ See Deut. 28[58], Lev. 19[12], Ex. 23 [20 l.], etc. The italics are Mr. Wiener's own.

‖ See Gen. 32[29], Judg. 13[17 l.].

answer to Moses' question : When the children of Israel say to me, What is His name ? what shall I say unto them ? God evades the question with the words ' I am that I am ' and refuses to give His name directly, but in [15, 16, 18] Moses, as a third person, is authorized to give it indirectly. In [5][23] Moses implies that something more was needed than this indirect use of the Divine Name and in [6][2] God responds by giving a new guarantee of Divine assistance—not the introduction of a new name, but a new direct use of the already known name, viz. in a self-revelation, which pledged Yahweh in a new way, a way which would be convincing to the Israelites in their then intellectual condition.

This is ingenious, but, in answer, it is sufficient to say that (1) the passages referred to in no way prove either that the Israelites had any aversion to uttering their own name * or (still less) that they or Moses himself attributed this ' savage ' superstition, as to the danger of uttering one's own name, to their God ; (2) it is impossible to understand how, *on Old Testament principles*, without a self-revelation on the part of God, the Patriarchs could know and use the Divine Name Yahweh at all. To suppose that man invented this name for his God, in the same way that, according to Gen. 2[19], " the man called every living creature," would indeed be a modern notion. The use of the name Yahweh in Genesis is explained by ' the dominant hypothesis ' as being due to a writer who believed that even before the Flood God revealed Himself as Yahweh. That is reasonable. If on the other hand we are to see in Genesis the work of only one author and if we are to accept the theory that there was no self-revelation of the Name

---

* Gen. 45[3, 4], ' I am Joseph,' supplies an exact parallel to ' I am Yahweh.' Jacob (Gen. 32[27]) and Ruth (Ru. 3[9]) have no aversion to giving their own name.

before Ex. 6², no explanation of how the Name came to be used in earlier days seems possible.

3. Dahse, in addition to the attempt just dealt with, endeavours to rewrite Ex. 6²,³ with the help of the LXX and thus to evacuate it of all significant meaning. I think that he would acknowledge that, as it stands, it can only bear the prima facie meaning. But that, he would say, is not the original form of the passage. (a) He points to the well-known fact that the LXX translates El Shaddai by ὁ θεός with a possessive pronoun ('thy' twice, 'my' 4 times, including 49²⁵, once 'their'). It has been an axiom in Textual Criticism that, other things being equal, the harder reading is to be preferred. The natural explanation of the LXX renderings is that the translators were puzzled by the archaic word Shaddai and avoided it by the substitution of something easy to understand. Dahse, however, prefers the easier reading for obvious reasons. Naville, we remember, does the same. But how then are we to account for the occurrence of the unusual Divine Name, El Shaddai, seven times in the Hebrew text ? Here is Dahse's explanation : (i) he reads El Shaddai in 49²⁵—no doubt correctly (see I 2 (d)), but in the other 6 passages he reads 'my (or 'thy' or 'their') God'; (ii) he brings in his 'Liturgical Editor' (Ezra), who, according to Dahse, divided the Pentateuch into 'Readings'! This Editor, it seems, wrote Ex. 6²ff· himself as a sort of recapitulation of Ex. 3ᵉˢᵖ· ¹⁵ff·. This was originally placed in the margin for the use of the Reader, but it was soon inserted in the text. (iii) Ex. 6²,³, according to Dahse, originally ran: 'I am Yahweh and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, being their God, but my name * I did not make known to

---

* Yahweh is omitted here in 2 cursives of the LXX, 1 Eth. MS., citations by Justin, Philo and others. Dahse seizes upon this to throw doubt upon Yahweh being original even in Ezra's day and then, assuming that it is

them.' But this production of the Liturgical Editor does not seem to have pleased the ' Theological Editor,' who came after him. Apparently this Editor thought the above to be very weak and colourless and so he substituted El Shaddai for ' being their God ' and inserted Yahweh after ' my name.' This necessitated his going back to Genesis and inserting El Shaddai in the five passages already mentioned (I 2 (d)). Presumably he took the title from Gen. 49. He did not alter 26^{24} (the self-revelation to *Isaac*), because he only added names in Ezra's insertions (28^3, 35^{11}, 48^3) or at the beginning of a Reading (17^1, 43^{14}) ! He however made up for the omission in 26^4 by inserting the name in Isaac's blessing of Jacob in 28^3. I use the word ' apparently ' above, because Dahse himself gives no reason, and we are therefore left to grope about for some conceivable motive which could have led an Editor to make such an extraordinary series of changes.

Could anything be more arbitrary and irrational than all this ? Who would have thought of such a theory, if he had not been hard put to it to explain away the clear meaning of Ex. 6^3, as it stands in the Hebrew text ? Moreover when could the Theological Editor have effected these changes ? The Samaritan Pentateuch supports the Hebrew text in every case, and this carries back these readings at latest to the 4th century B.C., i.e. nearly 100 years before the LXX translation was made.

How refreshing to turn from the feeble version of Ex. 6^{2-3}, given us by Dahse and quoted above, so unworthy of the solemn occasion on which it is said to have been uttered,

not original, to argue that therefore Ex. 6^{2-3} is a reference back to 3^{13} ff. The textual evidence is of the flimsiest ; and, even if it were strong and the argument sound, what has Dahse gained ? He has merely dated the revelation of the name Yahweh back a few weeks at the most, viz. to the revelation at the burning bush. He is no nearer to a proof of his own position. The name is still first revealed to Moses and not to the Fathers.

and read again the version of it, which we have given to us in our English Bible.   After full consideration of all that has been said on the other side, we can only conclude that the Hebrew text on which the latter is based stands firm and unshaken.*

III.   *Attempts to discredit the whole analysis, as built upon a precarious and shaky foundation.*

" The question," as Dr. Welch says (p. 346), " has been raised from two sides as to whether the differing use of the Divine Names, Yahweh or Elohim, forms a reliable basis for such an analysis."

1. Before measuring the force of these two types of criticism, it will be well to clear the ground by inquiring to what extent ' the differing use ' referred to *is* to-day the basis for the analysis.   Undoubtedly it was of inestimable value in the earlier stages of investigation, as setting students upon the track which led to the documents-hypothesis, but it has long ceased to be the sole basis. Present-day scholars with good reason believe in the substantial accuracy of the Hebrew text in regard to the Divine Names, but they do not think of denying that here and there in the course of transmission errors may have crept in, and they base their theory upon a much wider foundation.   Dr. Welch acknowledges this.   It is " perfectly true," he says, that " the whole question has now been shifted from so narrow a basis and has come to rest on a much wider foundation.   Difference in language, difference

* For a full discussion of Dahse's theory of the text see Dr. Skinner's *The Divine Names in Genesis,* chap. i, and note on pp. 270–1.   As for his theory that the usage of the Divine Names is largely determined by the Synagogue readings and that these were the work of Ezra, I do not know a single writer of repute who accepts it.   His friend and ally, H. M. Wiener, himself rejects it and, as Prof. Welch well says (p. 348), it " has been fully, in my judgment conclusively, answered by Dr. Skinner " (see *The Divine Names,* chaps. ii–viii).

in theological attitude, difference in moral and social outlook have now come in to supplement and correct the original single test." But he offsets this acknowledgment by disparaging these other criteria as equally unreliable on the grounds that these are (*a*) in some cases 'subjective' in character and (*b*) in others absent or so uncertain and even contradictory that finally the critic has nothing but the use of the Divine Name on which to base his analysis (pp. 349 ff.).

A few words must be said on each of these two points.

(*a*) The charge of 'subjectivity.' This Dr. Welch speaks of as "the curse of *all* Old Testament criticism." It is not then in any way peculiar to any particular set of critics. And indeed nothing could be more clearly 'subjective' than Dr. Welch's argument with regard to the story of the Flood (pp. 350–1). It is none the worse for that. Subjectivity is all right, so long as it is a sane and healthy subjectivity. There is no need to regard it as a curse. Differences in theological and cultural outlook are real. Dr. Welch uses them effectively in his new book, *The Code of Deuteronomy* (e.g. pp. 58–9), and no critic need be ashamed to use such criteria. But there are other criteria of a literary kind, which are not liable to this charge. Against them the Professor brings—

(*b*) the charge of inconclusiveness and uncertainty of import. It will be noted that the only examples given of this are 'the early stories of the period prior to the Flood.' It is quite true that in some of these, such as that of 'the Sons of God' in Gen. 6, literary criteria are less obvious and the theological outlook is not uniform, but that is only to be expected. The compiler incorporated these antique stories in his work with a minimum of change, the use of the name Yahweh being the clearest indication as to who

was the compiler.*   But in others, such as the two versions of the stories of Creation and the Flood, the phraseology and the details of the two presentations are markedly different and clearly differentiate the one from the other. As Dr. Welch says : ' P can be distinguished with ease ' (p. 362).   And after the first eleven chapters of Genesis, this charge has no longer any valid ground at all.   It needs also to be pointed out that admittedly the criterion of the differing use of the Divine Names is no longer available once Ex. 6 has been reached, yet the analysis is able to separate P from JE from Ex. 7 onwards with as much practical certainty as before.

On p. 352 Dr. Welch asserts that " neither the use of the divine names nor the use of other criteria leads to sure results.   And (he adds) when the insufficiency of the one method is pointed out, to seek refuge in the other is neither dignified nor convincing."   I am sorry that he says this. There is no thought of ' seeking refuge.'   The two methods have been in operation side by side from the days of Astruc and Eichhorn in the eighteenth century.   When the evidence of one witness is questioned, it is plain common sense to point out that his evidence does not stand alone but is corroborated by that of others.   I am sure that Dr. Welch would not rule out in similar terms those legal arguments, based on the cumulative force of a large number of pieces of circumstantial evidence, which are daily accepted in our Courts of Law.

2. Let us now consider the first of the two criticisms mentioned by Dr. Welch, leaving the second to be dealt with in the following Article.   " A number of students, such as Möller,† have insisted that Yahweh and Elohim

---

* Dr. Welch speaks of Dr. Skinner as reviving ' the old exploded fragmentary theory ' in his treatment of these stories.   On this see Article 1, p. 16, footnote.

† *Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung.*

are not employed as synonyms in the Old Testament. Elohim is frequently employed where we should employ an adjective like divine; Yahweh, on the other hand, often carries the sense of the God of revelation. . . . Hence a work of Elohim may simply correspond to what we should call a divine work, while a work of Yahweh may mean what we should name specifically an act of God in revelation or even in redemption."

There are two forms of this argument. (i) Möller, Naville and W. H. Green,* for example, would apply this line of argument to the whole body of uses of the Divine Names. Elohim, wherever it is used, means the God of Creation; Yahweh always signifies the God of revelation. The same writer could therefore use both names and pass readily from one to the other according to the particular connotation with which he wished to use it. But if so the hypothesis of different authors restricted to the use of either the one or the other of the two names falls to the ground. The weakness of this line of argument is that it " suffers from what is," according to Dr. Welch, " the curse of all Old Testament criticism—the subjective character " of the reasoning. It is easy for anyone with a lively imagination, and a determination to make the evidence point one way, to find subjective reasons why the one or the other Divine Name was used in any particular place, but as soon as these reasons are subjected to an impartial scrutiny it is seen how futile they often are. Of course there are passages in which critics of all types are agreed in recognizing that one name is more appropriate than another. The documentary theory attributes Gen. 3 to J but in verses 1-5 (the conversation between the woman and the serpent) Elohim is used. So, in other passages, Elohim is used in connexion with those who are (or are supposed to be) outside the

* *The Unity of the Book of Genesis.* Scribners, New York, 1895.

chosen line.*   It must be remembered that while P and
E were by their view prevented from using the name
Yahweh in Genesis, J had no view to prevent his using
Elohim.   No critic therefore uses the Divine Names as a
clue to analysis without discrimination.   But as soon as
this occasional use of Elohim in J is exceeded and the
attempt made to find a significant meaning in every use
of the Divine Names, the arbitrary character of the appli-
cations of the theory is clearly seen.   Take, e.g., Prof.
Green on Gen. 11²⁷–25¹¹.†   "Throughout this section," he
says, "the divine Names are used with evident discrimin-
ation.   Jehovah is used in 12–16.   Elohim does not occur
till chap. 17, where it is found repeatedly and with the
exception of ver. 1 exclusively."   Why, we ask, is this change
made in chap. 17 ?   Is it not still Jehovah, who enters into
covenant with Abraham ?   Is not this eminently a passage
where the name of the God of revelation should be used ?
Yes, but, says Green, the fulfilment of the promise given
twenty-four years before had been so long delayed that it
was necessary to emphasize the Divine omnipotence by
using El Shaddai and Elohim !   This section includes two
narratives of Abraham's deceit with regard to Sarah.   In
chap. 12 Yahweh is the name used, but in chap. 20 it is
Elohim.   In the first passage Green says that it is " Jehovah,
the God of the chosen race," who is appropriately named
as guarding Sarai, Abram's wife, in Egypt.   But, when
he comes to the second, he says " Elohim is the proper
word," because Abimelech was " a Gentile."   Wasn't
Pharaoh (chap. 12) also a Gentile ?   It is the same with the
two narratives relating to Hagar and Ishmael.   According

* E.g. 33⁵⁻¹¹ (Esau), 39⁹ (spoken to Potiphar's wife), 43²³,²⁹ (Joseph, as
Egyptian governor, and his Egyptian servant), 44¹⁶ (Judah and Joseph
as Egyptian governor).

† Op. cit., pp. 151–4.

to Green, in 21^{8-21} " Elohim is used throughout, because they are now finally severed from the family of Abraham ; whereas in 16^{7-13}, while Hagar still belonged to the family, it is the angel of Jehovah who finds her and sends her back " ! Green acknowledges that in 25^{11} " Jehovah would certainly have been appropriate here. And yet Elohim is appropriate likewise." It is evident that this critic would find appro- priateness in almost any possible use of the Divine Names. Even if Dahse succeeded in proving that the Names were to be altered in a number of cases in conformity with the LXX text, his ingenuity (were he still living) would enable him to give equally good (or bad) reasons for these new uses as once for the old.

We may add that, even if he were able to do this, he would be only at the beginning of his task. He would still have to explain how it comes to pass that in the passages assigned by so many scholars to P the use of Elohim is accompanied invariably by other linguistic phenomena and by different conceptions of worship and of history.

(ii) I am sure that Dr. Welch would not approve of the arbitrary methods, of which specimens have just been given. When he says that " Elohim is frequently used where we should employ an adjective like divine " and that " the contention can be supported by the differing use of the divine names in the later historical books," he may be referring to Baumgärtel's much more reasonable and scientific investigation of the uses of the Names out- side the Pentateuch, of which some account was given in the supplementary note to Article 1. If readers followed that statement and accepted as correct the application of Baumgärtel's method to the Pentateuch, they will have realized that at the outside only 33 uses of Elohim in Gen. 1– Ex. 3^{15} are affected by such reasoning and that with regard to the majority of these there is no dispute. They have

not been used by careful writers as marks of Elohistic authorship. But in any case, the utmost amount of change is to reduce the uses of Elohim, as a proper name and the equivalent of Yahweh in other passages, from 178 to 145, while the application of the same principles to Ex. 3^{16}– Deut. reduces similar uses of Elohim in those books from 61 to 22 ! The contrast between the use in Gen. 1-Ex. 3^{15} and that in Ex. 3^{16}–Deut. becomes not less but greater! As a matter of fact, whether Dr. Welch is referring to the lines of argument adopted in (i) or (ii) (he seems to me to mix up the two) he evidently does not regard this first method of attack as of much value. He speaks of the second method as raising " a much more serious objection." But at the same time he does use it. He writes : " If a writer was able to use Yahweh in the special sense and Elohim in the general sense, he *may* have used both names . . . and *may* have passed readily from one to the other. So soon however as this is recognized, the use of Yahweh or Elohim in *any* particular passage ceases to be a distinctive thing." * The point however is not what a writer *may* have done, but what a writer *has* done. On that point Dr. Welch does not commit himself. He calls for " renewed, close and unprejudiced examination " both as " to the reliability of the MT in connexion with the employment of the divine names " and as " to the practice throughout the whole of Scripture in the use of the same names," † but meantime leaves his readers in a haze of uncertainty. May I in the most friendly spirit use his own words in regard to other critics and call this proceeding " neither dignified nor convincing." † The haze seems to me to be one which

---

* There are five ' mays ' in eleven lines. And did Dr. Welch mean ' any particular passage ' or ' some particular passages ' ? The latter is all that Baumgärtel would contend for.

† EXPOSITOR, May, 1923, p. 352. The curious thing is that, although Welch

careful study of the actual usage of Genesis disperses. As we have seen, all critics realize that there are cases where Elohim is deliberately used by J, but in the vast majority of cases the use of the two names prior to Ex. 3, seems plainly attributable, not to the discriminating use of the names by one single writer, but to the different views of different writers as to the date at which the name Yahweh first became known to the people of Israel.

refers, in a footnote to this paragraph, to Baumgärtel's pamphlet, p. 13 f., he seems not to have read to the end or else he would surely have told us that Baumgärtel had made the very examination which he speaks of as so needed and that, as the result, he had come definitely to the conclusion that " the MT *has* faithfully transmitted the divine names " (see Article 3, Part III 3 v, in October issue, p. 88).

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

Article 3.   TEXTUAL CRITICISM.   THE MASSORETIC TEXT
AND THE SEPTUAGINT.

PROFESSOR WELCH based his thesis that 'the analysis of
the Genesis stories,' based upon 'the differing use of the
Divine Names Yahweh and Elohim,' has been 'seriously
shaken' upon two lines of criticism (EXPOSITOR, May, 1923,
p. 346).   The first line, viz., that the use of the Divine
Names was governed, not by the usage of different writers,

but by the differing value of the two names as used by one and the same writer, has been dealt with in the concluding section of the previous article. We saw ample reason for rejecting this as a quite insufficient explanation of the problem raised by the peculiar use of the Divine Names in Genesis, and in fact Prof. Welch himself evidently does not regard this line of argument as of much value. He rejects Möller's solution of the problem as ' so unconvincing that it has not called for very serious reply ' and he speaks of the second line as raising ' a much more serious objection ' (p. 347).

To the second line of criticism therefore let us now give our best attention. It is an attack upon the accuracy of the current Hebrew texts in the matter of the Divine Names. To quote Welch, " Dahse * in Germany and Wiener † in London have pointed out how often the Septuagint text differs from the Hebrew in the precise matter of the divine names and have insisted that in passages where the usage is at present uniform, the uniformity may not be original." It is well known that in other parts of the Hebrew Bible changes have been made in the Divine Names. " An entire Book of the Psalter (Book II, Pss. 42–72) exhibits by preference the name Elohim," and a comparison of Ps. 14 with Ps. 53 and of Ps. $40^{13t.}$ with Ps. 70 shows clearly that in, at any rate, some of the Psalms Elohim has been substituted for the original Yahweh.‡ What assurance then have we, these critics ask, that the present MT § of the Pentateuch represents the original ?

* *Textkritische Materialen zur Hexateuchfrage*, I. (1912); *A Fresh Investigation of the Sources of Genesis* (S.P.C.K., 1914).

† *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, *Pentateuchal Studies*, and *The Pentateuchal Text*.

‡ For the bearing of this upon the question at issue see Part III 2 vii (end).

§ Here and elsewhere MT is used for the Massoretic (Hebrew) Text (see Part I 1 below).

In fact, may we not say that in a large number of instances the Hebrew text underlying the LXX is clearly the more original ?

Not only has this last question been answered in the affirmative, but Wiener, followed by Welch, charges the scholars who hold ' the regnant hypothesis ' with ' unthinkingly ' accepting the trustworthiness of the MT. It doesn't seem to have occurred to them that the Dr. Driver (e.g.), who wrote the elaborate note on the chief ancient versions of the Old Testament in his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Clarendon Press, 1890, pp. xxxvi.–lxxxiv.) and who made such full use of the LXX in the text of that work, was not likely to have neglected the evidence of the versions when he had to deal with the Text of the Pentateuch and that the fact that he and others trusted to the MT rather than to the LXX was due not to want of thought but to exercise of thought on rational lines.

This latter I believe to be the true explanation, and the object of this Article is to show that their trust was not misplaced.

It is not part of my thesis to maintain the infallible accuracy of the MT in regard to the Divine Names. I question whether any modern scholar has denied that errors have occurred here and there in the course of transcription.* All that I am concerned to maintain is that the evidence fully justifies belief in the substantial accuracy of the MT, as representing the final canonical form of the Pentateuch.

The attack upon the MT of the Pentateuch and especially of Genesis, with which we are now concerned, has been

* See, e.g., Notes on Gen. 14[22] by Driver, *Genesis*, p. 166, and Carpenter and Harford, Ed.[1], Vol. II, p. 22, and on 28[20] by Skinner, *Divine Names*, p. 42.

made in the name of Textual Criticism. Let us remind ourselves what Textual Criticism is. According to Mr. J. P. Postgate (*Enc. Brit.*, vol. 20, p. 708), it is ' the skilled and methodical application of human judgment to the settlement of texts,' the aim being the ascertainment of the ' original form ' of any particular document as ' intended by its author.' This is no easy task. No one can hope to attain success in it, unless he be " a scholar who has prepared himself by general training in the analysis of texts and by special study of the facts bearing on particular cases." * " The best criticism is that which takes account of every class of textual facts and which assigns to each method its proper use and rank." " This conformity to rationally framed or rather discovered rules implies no disparagement of scholarship and insight. It does but impose salutary restraints on the arbitrary and impulsive caprice which has marred the criticism of some of those whose scholarship and insight have deservedly been held in the highest honour." Not all so-called Textual Criticism does observe these " salutary restraints," and I believe that the attempts made in that name to prove that the MT in the matter of the Divine Names in Genesis is untrustworthy recoil upon the heads of those who made them for just this reason. It is necessary to emphasize the words in Genesis.' We are not concerned with the text of the Old Testament as a whole, but with the text of the Pentateuch in particular (and indeed with an even narrower issue, viz., the reliability of the MT in the matter of the Divine Names in Genesis and Exodus). This is important, because ' the Law ' was recognized as canonical long before the rest of the Old Testament and it received a reverential

* This and the following quotations are from Dr. Hort's Introduction to *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, pp. 21, 19 and 65. The whole masterly exposition of the methods of Textual Criticism, pp. 19–72, should be consulted.

treatment at the hands of the Jews from the days of Ezra, which was not until much later accorded to their other scriptures. Statements about the condition of the MT and the value of the LXX in regard to later books must not be taken as applicable to the MT and the LXX in Genesis. We will look now, first, at the Massoretic text and, secondly, at the LXX text. The way will then be clear to proceed in Part III to decide which is the best witness to the original text.

Part I. *The Massoretic Text.*

1. The form in which the Hebrew text of the Old Testament is presented to us in MSS. and printed editions is called the Massoretic text, because it is the work of a guild of trained scholars known as Massoretes, i.e. Masters of the Massora or Tradition. In order to secure the accurate transmission and the proper pronunciation of the consonantal text, they added vowels and accents and compiled an elaborate series of notes upon its minutest peculiarities. The actual compilation of these notes went on from the sixth to the tenth centuries A.D., but it is practically certain that the consonantal text upon which they were based was fixed in the early part of the second century A.D. Several hundreds of MSS. of the Pentateuch were collated by Kennicott and de Rossi. The oldest date from the ninth and tenth centuries. They all exhibit the same text. The writings of Jerome in the fourth and of Origen in the third century show that the Hebrew text of their day was practically identical with the MT.

Evidence from the Targums and from Aquila (see 'Versions' below) carry this text back to the beginning of the second century. The scribes of that day probably chose as their exemplar " an old and well-written copy, possibly one of those which were preserved in the Court of the

Temple " (Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, p. 69). This copy was not a perfect replica of the original autographs, but whether errors had already actually arisen *in the matter of the Divine Names* is a matter to be determined on strictly scientific principles.

An examination of extant Hebrew MSS., containing Gen. 1[1] to Ex. 6[3], shows that in them the variations in the Divine Names are very slight indeed. Dr. Skinner (*Divine Names in Genesis*, pp. 264–6) has given a Table, showing a total of 51 variants in Genesis to 37 names. A study of it reveals the following facts. (i) The general accuracy of the MSS. in this respect is remarkable. Kennicott collated nearly 320 MSS. of Genesis in whole or in part, and de Rossi also collated hundreds. Only 46 K. MSS. and 22 de R. MSS., out of all these hundreds, show any variants at all. Of these 68 MSS. 39 have only one variant, 16 have two, 8 have three, 2 have four, 2 have five and 1 has six. (ii) Fifteen of the variants are in the 6 passages (18[3, 27, 31], 20[4]; 15[2, 8]) where Adonai or Adonai-Yahweh occurs. In these only do we find variants supported by more than 3 MSS. The cause of this is obvious. The sacred name YHWH was not pronounced at all. In public reading it was pronounced Adonai (or Elohim). A scribe, writing to dictation or pronouncing the words aloud before writing them down, was very liable to write the name pronounced instead of the name written in his exemplar. Of the remaining 36 variants 1 is impossible (Elohim Yahweh, 35[10]) ; 12 are omissions (in 10 cases by only one MS. each, 1 by two and 1 by three) ; 1 is an insertion (15[9]) by two MSS. ; the remaining 22 ring changes on Yahweh, Elohim and Yahweh-Elohim (2 only are read by as many as 3 MSS., 5 by 2, and 15 by 1 MS. each). (iii) Moreover we must weigh the MSS. as well as count them. Some swarm with corrections and erasures, some are too late to be of

any independent value. But even if we were to accept them all as of equal value, the wonder would still be, not that there are so many, but that there are so few, variants actually to be found. Those that there are are naturally accounted for as transcriptional errors. So far therefore as Hebrew MSS. go, there is nothing to lead one to doubt the accuracy of the MT.*

2. By good fortune we have in *the Samaritan Pentateuch* a most valuable witness to the reliability of the MT in the matter of the Divine Names. It is a recension of the Hebrew Pentateuch, possessed and used by the schismatic Samaritan community. Its antiquity is shown by the fact that it is written in a degenerate variety of the old Hebrew writing, which was essentially the same as that found upon the Moabite stone and in the tunnel of the Pool of Siloam. Moreover the hostility which existed between Jews and Samaritans after the schism was set up makes it practically certain that this Samaritan Pentateuch must date back to the time before the schism. When did the schism occur ? Opinion is divided between c. 430 B.C. (Neh. 13[8, 28]) and c. 330 B.C., when, according to Josephus, the Temple on Mt. Gerizim was built.† We have then here a witness, which at the latest takes us back to the fourth century B.C. On comparing the Samaritan with the Hebrew Pentateuch we find in the former (*a*) a series of intentional alterations, due in some passages to a desire to defend the legitimacy of their worship and in many others to a desire to produce a smoother and more intelligible text ; (*b*) a number of lengthy insertions from parallel passages ; and, apart from these, (*c*) a consonantal text very closely resembling the

---

* But, it may be said, these variant MSS. do not stand alone. They concur frequently with LXX and other witnesses. This will be dealt with later on (III 1 iv).

† See Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 118–121.

MT. Von Gall's edition brings out the remarkable uniformity of the Samaritan MSS. in the matter of the Divine Names. He registers only two variants in Gen. 1^1–Ex. 3^{15} (21^{17}, 'God' for 'Angel of God'; 30^{23}, 1 MS. omits 'God'). What then has this witness to say as to the Divine Names in this whole section? There are 344 occurrences of Yahweh (146), Elohim (178) and Yahweh Elohim (20). In 334 of these the Samaritan and Hebrew texts are absolutely agreed; in, at most, ten cases is there difference.*

Copyists' errors are the obvious solution in most, if not all, of these ten cases of divergence. But what of the 334 agreements? The fact that through two independent lines of descent, starting from 430 or 330 B.C., the Divine Names in the passage under review have been transmitted with so microscopic an amount of variation surely proves two things : (1) the care exercised by both Jewish and Samaritan copyists in transcribing the names of God, at least from the date of separation, and (2) the antiquity of the distribution of the names, which is now found in the MT. As regards this later point, the present Hebrew usage is seen to be practically identical with that which obtained in the fourth or fifth century B.C., i.e. either in the days of Ezra or at the latest within a century thereof.

* The Samaritan text read E for Y in Gen. 7^1, 14^{22} (where the names in both texts are probably late additions, 20^{18} and Ex. 3^4; it reads Y for E in 7^9, 28^4, $31^{7, 9, 16a}$ (and Ex. 6^{2a}); it adds E in 35^{9b}. In 5 of these 10 divergencies the Samaritan stands absolutely alone. In the other 5 it is supported as follows :

	Hebrew MSS.	LXX authorities.	Other versions.
7^1	2	cw Arm-codd	Pesh. (except Cod. D= Brit. Mus. Add. 14,445, dated A.D. 464)
7^9	1	E.	Vulg.
20^{28}	—	bw ej Boh. Phil-arm	
31^9	1	—	—
35^9	—	Practically unanimous	—

This last reading is an *addition* of Elohim, a divergence which makes no difference to the documentary analysis, because chap. 35 regularly uses Elohim (or El, vers. $^{1, 3, 7, 11}$), never Yahweh.

3. The Targums are based on the oral ' interpretation ' into the vernacular Aramaic, which accompanied the reading of the Law in the Synagogue, when Biblical Hebrew had ceased to be a living tongue.   The Babylonian Targum (Onkelos) is of no use to us, because in its written form it employs invariably Yahweh (in an abbreviated written form) as the one Divine Name.   The Palestinian Targum (pseudo-Jonathon) is highly paraphrastic and in its present form belongs to the eighth century A.D.   Its divergencies from the MT in the matter of the Divine Names are all in one direction, i.e. it usually substitutes Y for E, never E for Y.   It gives us no light upon the original Hebrew text.

4. Before the middle of the second century A.D. the LXX had fallen into disrepute with the Rabbis as not sufficiently in accordance with the standard Hebrew text, and a Jewish scholar, named Aquila, produced an extremely literal translation from Hebrew into Greek, which ' reproduced peculiarities of Hebrew construction in conscious defiance of Greek grammar and idiom.'   Hence it is a very valuable witness to the standard Hebrew text.   Unfortunately only fragments and citations and marginal notes remain.   Out of the 344 uses of the names in Gen. 1^1–Ex. 3^{15} as proper names, there are only 32 where the readings of Aquila have been preserved.   In 31 of these Aquila and the MT agree. In Gen. 30^{24} Aquila agrees with LXX, Symmachus and Peshitta in reading Elohim, while all Hebrew MSS. and Samaritan read Yahweh.   The evidence, so far as it goes, indicates that the differences between Aquila and the MT were few and far between.

5. The Syriac Version—the Peshitta.

Nothing is certainly known as to the origin of this version, but it is common ground that it was translated direct from the Hebrew in the second century A.D. and that, at least in some MSS. and in some parts of the Old Testament, it has

been partially revised in accordance with the LXX. Out of the 344 uses of the Divine Names there are only 11 undoubted variants from the MT ; in 4 more passages one to four out of five, editions read a text differing from the MT.*

The agreements with the MT are from 329 to 333. At least the larger proportion of the differences may reasonably be regarded as translator's or copyists' errors. If any of them are due to real differences between the Hebrew MS. (or MSS.) underlying the Peshitta and the official Hebrew text, they are so few in number that we can only conclude that, in that case, the former must have been an offshoot from the latter at a date later than the divergence of the Samaritan from the Hebrew.

6. The Vulgate was translated from the Hebrew by Jerome at the end of the fourth century. In only five cases (4^1, $6^{3,5}$, 7^9, 15^6) does the Clementine Vulgate read a different name from that in the MT, and in two of these (4^1, 7^9) there is strong MS. support for the name which agrees with the MT, so much so that Cardinal Carafa, Editor of the Louvain Bible, adopts the latter reading in both cases. The cases in which the Vulgate omits a Divine Name are, as a rule at any rate, due simply to the character of the Latin idiom and style. †

So far we have found nothing to shake our faith in the substantial trustworthiness of the MT as regards the

* Gen. 3^{11} ins. Y, 3^{24} ins. YE, 7^1 E, 13^{10b} E, 14^{22} om. Y, 15^6 E, 22^{11} E, 22^{15} E, 29^{32} E, 30^{24} E, 31^{16b} Y. The doubtful readings are 3^{13} Y for YE in 1 edition, 30^{27} E for Y in 2 editions, 4^{10} ins. Y and 13^{10a} E for Y in 4 editions. In 7 (? 9) cases Elohim is read for Yahweh, in 1 Y for E, in 1 (? 2) Y is inserted and in 1 Y is omitted. Support is given to two (? 4) readings by LXX alone, to one by LXX and Vulg., to one by LXX, Aquila and Symmachus, to one by Samaritan (?), 2 Heb. MSS., 2 LXX cursives and Armenian MSS., to one by 2 Heb. MSS. alone, to one by the Georgian version and to one (? two) by one or two minor LXX MSS. Three (? four) have no outside support at all. (See Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 140-4.)

† See Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 144-5 and 281-8, and next month's continuation of this article, III 2 v.

Divine Names in the Pentateuch and especially in Genesis.

But at this point Dahse and Wiener and others come in with the persistent, one may say the triumphant, cry : But what about the LXX ? It is the greatest and the most ancient of our versions and takes us back behind the MT and Samaritan, etc. ; and, when we open and read it, we find a wide divergence from the MT-Sam.-Peshitta tradition. Here and not in the MT we find, as a rule, the true text of the Pentateuch. If insistence and confidence would carry the day, this theory would now be generally accepted and the MT discredited. But facts are stubborn things. To them let us go and see if, at the voice of practically one witness, the verdict so far arrived at must be reversed. We will look at the history of the LXX and the state of its text. We will then look at the arguments put forth by a typical exponent of the LXX theory and test their value. Finally we will seek to sum up the discussion and to arrive at a right decision on the point at issue, viz., the reliability or otherwise of the Divine Names as given in the Massoretic text.

Part II. *The Septuagint.*

1. *The history of the LXX and the present condition of its text.* *

i. According to ' the letter of Aristeas ' the Pentateuch was translated into Greek in Alexandria in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–247 B.C.). Even though this document is not in all respects trustworthy, the date cannot be very far wrong. This translation was clearly intended to supply the needs of the Alexandrian synagogue, the Jews of Egypt being Greek-speaking and no longer conversant with Biblical Hebrew. The Law only at this time was fully canonical and the translation of it would be made

---

* See Swete's Introduction, Part I ; Driver on text of Samuel, pp. xl.-lxxxii. ; Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, Lect. IV and V.

under a strong sense of responsibility. The Greek Pentateuch accordingly " is on the whole a close and serviceable translation." (Other parts of the Old Testament were translated at different times and with different ideals, the process being completed in all probability before the Christian era. But with these we have not to deal in this article.) There are palæographical reasons for thinking that the Pentateuch was translated from a Hebrew text written in archaic characters. (See Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. lxv.)

ii. The original text of the LXX had suffered corruptions before the Christian era. Philo's quotations are sufficient evidence of this (Swete, pp. 372–6). It had deteriorated still further by the time of Origen. Efforts were therefore made to revise it. At Cæsarea Origen, at Antioch Lucian, and in Egypt Hesychius endeavoured to restore the text to its original purity. But this only added to the confusion. Origen sought to correct it by comparison with the Hebrew text of his day. When he found in the LXX words which had no equivalent in the Hebrew, he left them in and marked them with obeli (– , with or without dots above and below) ; when words were wanting, he added them (generally from one of the later versions), marking them with asterisks (*). This recension was often copied without the signs and often mixed with other recensions. Fortunately it is still to be found in a relatively pure form and with the signs in the uncials G, M, in a few cursives and especially in the Syro-hexaplar version (Swete, pp. 59–78).

Lucian (with Dorotheus, who was a Hebrew, as well as a Greek, scholar) revised the LXX, in all probability, on the same principles as governed the Antiochene revision of the New Testament. His main aim seems to have been lucidity and completeness, but he also consulted the Hebrew text current in Syria in the third century A.D., and this

seems to have differed in a number of places from the text which lay before the Alexandrian translators five centuries before (Swete, pp. 80–85).

Hesychius about the same time revised the current LXX text for the Egyptian Church. This recension is probably represented fairly well by the text of codex Q (Prophets only), and certain cursives. Ceriani has shown that this text agrees closely with the text underlying the Egyptian versions and that which is reflected in the writings of Cyril of Alexandria.

The result of all this was not satisfactory. In Jerome's time men read their Old Testament in one or other of these three recensions according to their country of residence. As time went on these texts became fused in varying proportions in different manuscripts. Groups of MSS. are recognizable to-day, which seem to answer more or less to this recension or that, but the greater number present mixed texts, which almost defy analysis.*

iii. When we pass from MSS. to the versions made from the LXX and not direct from the Hebrew, we find valuable guidance towards the recovery of the original Greek Text, but here too the fusion of different types of text greatly complicates the problem. When, e.g., Dr. Swete tries to group the authorities which are generally supposed to represent the three recensions, he has to include the Armenian version as ' in part ' belonging to all three ! *The Old Latin* is pre-hexaplaric and in general of great value, but in regard to the names of God, its evidence is unreliable, owing to the tendency to confuse the Latin contractions (Dn̄s and Ds̄) for Dominus and Deus (see Prof. Burkitt's *The Rules of Tyconius*, p. lix. and very many pages of the text). *The Egyptian versions* probably reflect

* See article on "The Classification of Greek MSS. of the Hexateuch," by Dr. A. V. Billen (*J.T.S.*, April, 1925).

the Hesychian revision, but " much yet remains to be done before these versions can be securely used in the work of reconstructing the text of the Greek Old Testament " (Swete, p. 108). *The Ethiopic version* again is valuable, but Lagarde maintained that " the printed texts [did not] furnish a secure basis for the employment of this version for the reconstruction of the LXX " (Swete, p. 110). *The Syro-hexaplar* is " an exact reflection in Syriac of the Hexaplaric Greek text, as read at Alexandria at the beginning of the seventh century " (Swete, p. 114). *The Armenian version* " shows a typical hexaplar text in Genesis and Exodus " (McLean in Swete, p. 119). *The Palestinian Aramaic* resembles in its literal character the last two versions.

iv. The last helps to textual reconstruction of the LXX are quotations in Jewish writers (Philo and Josephus), the N.T. and the writings of Christian Fathers of the first four or five centuries, especially, (in Greek) Justin, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria and (in Latin) Irenæus, Cyprian, Hilary, Lucifer, Tyconius and Latin translations of Origen. The unsatisfactory state of the text of most editions of the Fathers, their habit of quoting inexactly from memory and of weaving together different passages and the influence of familiar quotations in the New Testament make it extremely difficult to be sure of the exact value of particular patristic quotations. A knowledge of the context is often vitally important.

The extent of the internal variant readings revealed by the collation of MSS., versions and quotations may be gauged in some measure by the fact that, if we take the list of variants recorded in the apparatus criticus of the larger Cambridge LXX, we find that out of 1,530 verses in Genesis only 3 have been copied, translated and quoted without variation by these various authorities. These

verses are $1^{1,19}$ and 21^{24} and contain 10, 8 and 5 words respectively. It is therefore to be expected that this tendency to error should show itself in the transmission, translation and quotation of the Divine Names as well as in the rest of the Greek Text. And as a matter of fact this is very much the case. In the MT the variants for the Names of God in MSS. and versions (apart from the LXX) are extremely rare. " In the Greek Pentateuch perhaps no element of the text is so liable to variation as the names for God." In Gen. 1^1 to Ex. 3^{15a} out of 350 uses of the Names (as proper names) in the LXX, separately or in combination, only 90 have no internal variants, while the remaining 260 have from one to three or four variants.

2. *A tentative statement of the witness of the LXX as to the use of the Divine Names.*

The perusal of the foregoing very condensed statements of the history and present condition of the LXX and of the materials available for its reconstruction will show to an attentive reader that the task before the Critic, who seeks to ascertain the true Text of the original LXX version of the Pentateuch, is an extremely difficult and delicate one. So difficult is it that no scholar or group of scholars has yet ventured to produce a critically revised text of the original LXX. That great Textual scholar, Lagarde, before his lamented death did produce the first volume (Gen.–Esther) of a provisional text of one recension (Lucian's), but he was careful to disclaim the idea that his work was final and Swete warns us against quoting Lagarde's text as ' Lucian ' without reserve. Even if it were satisfactorily ' Lucian,' the final goal would still be far off. As Lagarde wrote in his preface, " the restoration of the text common to any one family must not be regarded as more than a step forward in the right direction, and even a critical text, when reached by these or other means,

will not be free from the element of uncertainty " (see Swete, p. 485). But extremely difficult though it be, the scholar, who would use the LXX as a witness to the Hebrew Text underlying it, is compelled (until such a critically revised text is put forward by men who have given their lives to the study) to come to some tentative conclusions of his own as to what was probably the original text. Here it is only possible to state the results at which the present writer has arrived in the most summary manner. Footnotes giving references will enable the reader to check these results. The evidence upon which they are based is set forth fully in the larger Cambridge Septuagint.

Taking the 344 occurrences of the Divine Names as proper names in the MT of Gen. 1^1–Ex. 3^{15a} we find that in 266 cases the Greek translation agrees with the MT, in 53 it almost certainly differs from it, and in 25 the evidence is so conflicting that, at present, certainty is hardly possible. Moreover in the LXX we find 7 clear, and 2 doubtful, additional occurrences of δ $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ and 2 additional of $K\acute{v}\rho\iota o\varsigma$. Deduct from these the 5 omissions included in the 53 clear differences mentioned above and we arrive at the total of 350 Divine Names in the LXX as compared with 344 in the MT.*

The Table on p. 66 shows the number of occurrences of each name in the MT and the corresponding readings in the LXX.

Bearing in mind what we have learnt about

I. The Massoretic Text and II. The Septuagintal Text, we must now confront the one with the other and seek to ascertain

---

* The total occurrences of the Divine Names in MT and in LXX may be summarized as follows. We find in the MT 178 Elohim, 146 Yahweh and 20 Yahweh Elohim, total 344 ; in the LXX 193 δ $\theta\epsilon\delta s$ (including 2 doubtful additions), 1 $\theta\epsilon o\acute{\iota}$ (Gen. 3^5), 99 $\kappa\acute{v}\rho\iota o s$, 32 $\kappa\acute{v}\rho\iota o s$ δ $\theta\epsilon\delta s$, 25 doubtful, total 350.

III. The comparative merits of the two Texts.

Has the LXX in the Pentateuch been translated from a purer text than the MT, or the reverse ? Or does it represent essentially the same Hebrew Text, its differences being due in the main to translational or transcriptional errors ?

1. There are four points of a general character which deserve preliminary consideration.

(i) In the case of the MT we have a text in the original language, whereas in the case of the LXX we have to deal with a version in another tongue. The MT is written in the later Aramaic script, but evidently in the Pentateuch it was transliterated from the earlier Hebrew script with scrupulous care. In the LXX we have to deal with differ-

TABLE

MT

Yahweh	. 146	Elohim 178	Yahweh Elohim 20	Not in MT

LXX

κύριος . .	93	. . 4 *	0	2
ὁ θεός . .	19 †	. . 160 ‡	5 §	? 9
θεοί		. . 1 ‖		
κύριος ὁ θεός	16 ¶	. . 4 **	 12	
omitted . .	1 ††	. . 4 ‡‡	 0	
doubtful .	17 §§	. . 5 ‖‖	. . . . 3 ¶¶	
	146	178	20	11

　* Gen. 19^{29a}, 21$^{2, 6}$, Ex. 3^{4b}.

　† Gen. 4$^{1, 4, 16}$, 6$^{6, 7}$, 13$^{10a \& b, 13}$, 15$^{6, 7}$, 16^{5}, 18$^{1, 14}$, 25^{21b}, 30$^{24, 27}$, 31^{49}, 38$^{7b, 10}$.

　‡ including θεοσέβαια for ' fear of God ' (20^{11}).

　§ Gen. 2$^{5, 7, 9, 19, 21}$.

　‖ Gen. 3^{5}.

　¶ Gen. 4$^{6, 15a \& b, 26}$, 5^{29}, 6$^{3, 5, 8}$, 7$^{1, 5, 16b}$, 8$^{21a \& b}$, 10^{9a}, 11^{9b}, 29^{31}.

　** Gen. 6^{12}, 8^{15}, 9^{12}, 28^{20}.

　†† Gen. 14^{22}.

　‡‡ Gen. 1^{28}, 9^{16}, 31^{50b}, Ex. 2^{25b}.

　§§ Gen. 4$^{3, 9, 13}$, 8^{20}, 10^{9b}, 11$^{6, 9a}$, 12^{17}, 13$^{4, 14}$, 15$^{4, 18}$, 16^{7}, 24^{40}, 26^{2}, 28^{13b}, 32^{9}.

　‖‖ Gen. 6^{22}, 7$^{9, 16a}$, 21^{4}, Ex. 3^{1}.

　¶¶ Gen. 2^{4b}, 3$^{13, 22}$.

ences of thought and idiom, and transcriptional probabilities vary in the two languages. This last fact is well exemplified in the case of the two Divine Names.

(ii) In Hebrew the two Divine Names are sharply distinguished, the one being purely a proper name and the other a generic (or common or appellative) name, used as a proper name in particular cases. But, at the time when the LXX translation was made, the sacred name of four letters had ceased to be pronounced and the reader of Scripture habitually substituted the word Adonai (i.e. Lord). (In the rare cases where Adonai preceded Yahweh he substituted Elohim.) Where therefore the Hebrew text was YHWH, the Greek translator as a rule translated by κύριος (or sometimes ὁ κύριος), and where the Hebrew word was Elohim, he translated by ὁ θεός. But κύριος and θεός (Lord and God) are both common nouns in Greek and therefore, while the Jew who knew Hebrew knew well what κύριος stood for, the ordinary Greek-speaking individual did not. He would tend to class them together as synonyms and would not regard it as of great importance whether the one name or the other stood in a particular passage. It is obvious therefore that the possibility of substituting one name for the other would be greater in the case of the Greek copyist than in that of the Hebrew.

(iii) In most cases in which we have to decide between the claims of rival variant readings, the Textual critic is able to call in the help of 'intrinsic probability'; one reading seems to make better sense than its rival or rivals. But in the case of the Divine Names this can rarely, if ever, be done. Taking a sentence in isolation from the context, one name makes as good sense as the other. It is only when one of the speakers is a non-Israelite that there is intrinsic probability in favour of Elohim rather than Yahweh, and in such passages there is no difference between MT

and LXX. I exclude for the moment the question of the accompanying phraseology and of possible different documents in which different Divine Names are used. If these be considered, intrinsic probability has more to say.*

(iv) The possible variants are strictly limited. If a scribe went astray in copying a Divine Name, he could only substitute Elohim for Yahweh, or *vice versa*, or put the two names together. Out of 344 uses of one or other name, or both names together, in MT it is transcriptionally not improbable that an ordinary copyist would make one or more accidental errors of this kind in a given MS., and it is obvious that, when the range of possible alternatives is so small, if two copyists (say one Hebrew and one Greek, or a Greek Father quoting the passage) did go wrong at the same place, the errors they made would in most cases coincide. As a matter of fact, in a large proportion of cases, both, sometimes all three, alternatives are found in LXX MSS., daughter-versions or quotations, and therefore there is an exceedingly good chance that, when a Hebrew MS. differs from the MT, it will find some kind of support in the LXX. " In all but two (1^{28}, 19^{29a}) of the twenty-two actual instances [in Genesis] of agreement (against the MT) between Hebrew and Greek MSS., the Massoretic reading is also represented in MSS. of the LXX and in the vast majority of cases far more strongly attested than the variant " (Dr. Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 103–4). This being so, the argument from the agreement between occasional Hebrew MSS. and LXX MSS. is practically worthless.

* See 2 vi below.

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS.

Article 3. TEXTUAL CRITICISM (*continued*).

Part III. The comparative merits of the MT and the LXX Text. In last month's issue we adduced :

1. Four general considerations (see EXPOSITOR for September).

2. We must now consider the alleged case against the Massoretic Text. No one in England has laboured more wholeheartedly to discredit the MT than Mr. H. M. Wiener.* Prof. Welch speaks of ' his clear cross-exam-

---

* Mr. Wiener has at times complained that his writings have not been accorded the careful consideration they deserved. I hope that he will

ination of the defence' and 'his convincing insistence on its insufficiency.' *

Let us then see what sort of a case Wiener makes against the MT.

He attacks the MT on the ground that :

i. The existing MSS. (with one exception, of the seventh century) only go back to the ninth or tenth century A.D., and 'with slight exceptions represent but one official recension, the work of certain persons unknown (commonly called Massoretes) at some time unknown on critical principles unknown.' † The steps taken to secure accurate transmission have resulted in an extreme rarity of variants.

[For answer ‡ see Article 3 I (1) The Massoretic text, and (2) the Samaritan text, where we saw that Jerome, Origen, the Targums and Aquila shew that the Hebrew text current in their days was practically identical with the MT, and that the Samaritan text carries the same essentially similar text much further back still.]

ii. The MT was based on a single faulty archetype at a time when critical principles would not be well under-

recognize that I have done my best to consider and weigh the case he has presented. He has so frequently given vigorous expression to his opinions about the critics with whom he has disagreed that I feel sure that he will take in good part the outspoken expression of my opinion about his own arguments, and will welcome an honest effort to arrive at the truth, however much he may disagree with the conclusion arrived at. His studies are often so acute and suggestive, when he is not swayed by the wish to prove that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, that I cannot but feel that, if only he would abandon the attitude of Advocate for the attitude of Judge, though he might lose some of his present clientèle, he would greatly advance the cause of truth.

* I am not sure what Dr. Welch means by ' the defence ' which Wiener cross-examines. If he means Dr. Skinner's *Divine Names in Genesis* Wiener's *Reply* to that book seems to me most unconvincing.

† The passages quoted in this and the following numbered paragraphs are taken from Mr. Wiener's *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 10–41, and *The Pentateuchal Text, a Reply to Dr. Skinner*, passim.

‡ The passages in *square brackets* throughout the whole section are *my comments* on Wiener's arguments.

stood. A story is told in the Talmud (Taanith iv. 2), on the authority of a certain Rabbi, Resh Lakish, that the editors used three codices which were kept in the Temple, adopting in every case of difference the reading of the majority.

[Wiener quotes this story as Gospel Truth and, on the strength of this and similar Rabbinic traditions, mocks at the MT. Is it any more likely to be true than the well-known story as to the way in which the Seventy-two arrived at unanimity in their LXX translation ? Wiener tells us himself that only four differences are mentioned in Taanith iv. 2 (only three according to Strack's art. " Text of the Old Testament," *Hastings' Dict.* iv. p. 731), none of any importance (one is seemingly corrupt Greek and, according to Talm. *Meg.* 9a, an alteration made by the Seventy-two). Wiener also quotes one of the 18 ' corrections of the scribes,' as traditionally handed down, as shewing that the original text of Gen. 18[22] ran : ' And Yahweh stood before Abraham.' This seems to be merely a daring conjecture. It has no single MS., version or quotation in its favour and intrinsic probability is altogether against it. But it serves Wiener's purpose of discrediting the MT, and therefore he quotes it as though it were unassailable.]

iii. " A glance at the margins of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* will show that according to such a modern scholar as Kitte the standard Hebrew has to be set aside *time after time on every page.*" * [One is tempted to take Wiener's " a glance " as indicating the kind of treatment which he has himself given to these margins. But the truth is that this is but a typical specimen of Wiener's exaggerated statements. Let us take at random 20 pages in Genesis in Kittel's edition (covering approximately Gen. 25 to 36). Excluding merely vocalic changes, Kittel sets aside the MT in 40 cases and

* The italics in the quotation are my own, not the author's.

queries 32 others, i.e. he actually sets aside on an average two readings per page. Many of the alterations are very trivial and are at best the opinion of one man. Kittel registers in the margin many other MS. and versional variants, but does not adopt them. And, be it noted, *not one* of the readings adopted by Kittel affects a Divine Name, although there are 67 such names in the 20 pages which we have examined. This is strong evidence that the Divine Names are a remarkably stable element of the Hebrew Text.]

iv. The Nash Papyrus has shown that Hebrew texts of the Law differing widely from the Hebrew-Samaritan, but strongly resembling the LXX, had currency in Egypt for centuries after the LXX translation was made. This proves that the Egyptian community were quite satisfied with the old Egyptian Hebrew text, the original ancestor of which broke off from the parent Hebrew stem *before* MT and Samaritan.*

[What is this Nash Papyrus ? It is a scrap of papyrus, now preserved in Cambridge University Library, which originally contained the Ten Commandments and the Shema (' Hear, O Israel,' etc.), written in cursive Hebrew. It was probably a scapula ; it has been folded once from top to bottom and four times across. Twenty-four lines survive. The two expert authorities upon it are Prof. F. C. Burkitt and Dr. S. A. Cook.†

The text of the ten commandments combines those of the MT in Exodus and in Deuteronomy, agreeing sometimes with the one and sometimes with the other. It

* The last point is an assumption, which Wiener has vainly tried to prove. See EXPOSITOR, Sept. 1911, and Skinner's *Divine Names,* pp. 125-135 and 276-281.

† Burkitt, *Jew. Q. Rev.* xv. (1902-3) ; S. A. Cook, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology* (Jan. 1903); and see Canon Charles, *The Decalogue,* pp. xiii.-xliv.

probably shews the *liturgical* custom of the synagogues in Egypt at the time when the commandments were read daily before the Shema. Most of the agreements with Deuteronomy are also found in the LXX of Exodus, but not all, and the Shema is prefaced by an addition, which is found in the LXX of Deuteronomy 6⁴, but not in the MT.

These agreements with the LXX shew that some things in the Greek also existed in a Hebrew text, but, says Prof. Burkitt, " there remains the more serious question, which is really *the better text*—that of Aquila and the Massoretes, or that of the Nash Papyrus and the LXX ? In this case I must vote for the MT. The MT seems to me the more archaic and therefore the more genuine. . . .* MT here is the scholarly reproduction of an old MS., containing no serious errors, while the Nash Papyrus is a monument of popular religion, giving a text of the commandments with the grammatical difficulties smoothed down." The MT is not perfect, but " it does not follow that all the labours of the Sopherim were thrown away, or that every variant is a relic of a purer text. Especially is this the case with the Pentateuch." I have only given a tithe of the points in Prof. Burkitt's article, but I think that I have given enough to shew that the Nash Papyrus text, supported as it is by the LXX in a number of cases, is not the proof of the survival in Egypt of a purer Text than that of the MT, but rather of the reverse.]

v. The Vulgate proves that the MT often differs from the Hebrew text used by Jerome. In justification of this statement Wiener quotes an article by a Roman Catholic writer, Rev. Hugh Pope, O.P., in the *Irish Theological Quarterly* (Oct. 1913, pp. 375–398).†

---

* Cogent and detailed reasons are given here by Prof. Burkitt, which I reluctantly omit.

† *Reply* in *Bibl. Sacra*, pp. 241–244.

[Unfortunately for Wiener, when he wrote his *Reply*, Dr. Skinner's articles on *The Divine Names in Genesis* had not been republished in book-form. If they had, he would have realized upon what a broken reed he was leaning. In a supplementary note (pp. 281–288), Skinner shews (1) that ' the proved deviations of the Hebrew basis of the Vulgate from the MT are for the most part well within the limits of probable scribal error subsequent to the fixing of the standard text,' and that such divergence as exists in the highly technical sections which Mr. Pope selects in Exod. 35–40 is chiefly due to ' condensed paraphrase in translation ' ; (2) ' that Mr. Pope has fallen into the gross error of fancying that in the *Liber Hebraicarum Questionum in Genesim* Jerome is commenting on a Hebrew text,' whereas, ' apart from very rare and exceptional cases, it is as certain as anything can be that the *lemmata* on which he bases his exposition are taken (directly or indirectly) from the LXX ; and the only doubtful question is whether he is citing the Old Latin version of the LXX or translating from the LXX itself.' ' Whatever Jerome is doing he is not translating from a Hebrew MS. His *references* to the Hebrew are frequent and detailed, and in no case (except behām for behām in 14⁵) do they imply a consonantal text different from our MT ' ; (3) that Mr. Pope lays stress upon 12 omissions in chapters 1–11 of the Divine Name whereas ' no one with any sense of Hebrew idiom, or who has considered Jerome's practice as a translator, will have any hesitation in saying that the omissions did not occur in the Hebrew text that Jerome was translating.' In, e.g., Gen. 11⁹ ' the " Yahwe " could not possibly have been absent from the Hebrew and its omission in the Vulgate is due entirely to the substitution of the passive for the active construction.' As to the four cases in these eleven chapters (4¹, 6³· ⁵, 7⁹) in which the Vulgate (Clementine text) reads a different

name from the MT, in 4^1 and 7^9 there is strong MS. support for the name which agrees with the MT, and Cardinal Carafa, as we have seen (I 6), in both cases prefers the reading of the MT. ' After all there are only about *three* thoroughly attested variant Divine Names in the Vulgate of Genesis, the omissions being due to reasons of style.' As a matter of fact, ' there are a great many circumstances which conspire to reduce to a minimum the probability that any reading of the Vulgate goes back to a Hebrew independent of the Massoretic recension.']

vi. The MT in certain passages " is on internal grounds demonstrably wrong in its use of the Divine Names and the true reading has been preserved in a small minority of Hebrew or Greek MSS." * The passages adduced by Wiener are Gen. 4^1, 16^{11}, $30^{42, 27}$, 48^{15}, 14^{22}, 15^2, $31^{42, 53}$, Ex. 3^1, Gen. 28^{13}.

[It is impossible in this Article to deal with all the passages *seriatim*.

Let us take the first two as they come, and see whether in these cases Wiener has made good his claim.

(*a*) Gen. 4^1. Wiener argues that the man who wrote 4^{26}, " then began men to call upon the name of Yahweh," could not also have written that Eve said " I have gotten a man with the help of Yahweh." To this there are two answers : (1) There is no necessary contradiction between the two. Wiener says that Eve could not have used the name Yahweh ' before it was known ' (*Reply*, p. 266), but 4^{26} does not say that the name was not *known* before the days of Enosh, but that in his days men began to offer worship in that name. In $4^{4, 5}$, however, we have the bringing of offerings to Yahweh by Cain and Abel. The more satisfactory answer is that (2) ' independent narratives

---

* *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 17–19. *Reply, Bibliotheca Sacra*, pp. 257–264.

have been editorially combined within the group designated as J.' There are indications that $4^{1-16a,\ 17-24,\ 25-26}$ represent three such narratives * by different writers or at least from different sources. ' On internal grounds ' therefore it is impossible to ' demonstrate ' that ' Yahweh ' in 4^1 is wrong. It may rather be pointed to as shewing how scrupulously the Hebrew copyists adhered to their text, when on superficial grounds a change might have been deemed advisable. As to external grounds, the evidence is conflicting. The LXX unanimously reads τοῦ Θεοῦ, but Sam. Pesh. Vulg. agree with the MT. The LXX may here preserve the original name, but it is much more probable that the version, which reads ' God ' for ' Lord God ' at least five times in chapters 2–3, in chapter 4 reads ' God ' in verse 4 unanimously, in verse 16 almost so and inserts it in verse 10, and reads ' Lord God ' in $4^{6,\ 13,\ 15,\ 15}$, may have deliberately or accidentally substituted the reading ' God ' in 4^1. There is certainly no demonstrably wrong reading in the MT here.

(b) Gen. 16^{11}. The MT explains the name Yishmaʿ-el (i.e. may El hear !) by the words : ' for Yahweh has heard. This Wiener says is impossible. The original word must have been Elohim. When it is pointed out that Sam. Pesh. Vulg. and LXX (all 3 extant uncials, 19 cursives and 4 daughter-versions, as noted in the Cambridge Edition) agree with the MT, he replies that *one* Hebrew MS. reads Elohim and that the Old Latin and 2 cursives (bw) of the LXX support it, while 3 cursives (fir) read ' Lord God,' and that one Hebrew MS. reads El, corrected by the same first hand to YHWH. Truly a touching belief in minorities ! The whole contention ' on internal grounds ' (as well as on external) breaks down, when it is realized that El and Elohim are not convertible terms. El is an

* See Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch*, vol. ii., pp. 5–6.

archaic name, which had ceased to be used in ordinary speech. The explanation therefore had to be made by using one of the two current Divine Names, and a writer would naturally use that name which it was his habit to employ. 16[11] occurs in a Yahwistic context and therefore Yahweh is used. In 21[17], where there is an apparent allusion to the same name, Yishma'-el, the narrative is Elohistic and Elohim is used. The explanation of the name Samuel in 1 Sam. 1[20], where the MT is supported by Pesh. Vulg. and LXX (there are a good many MS. variants, but not one omits the $Kv\varrho\acute{\iota}ov$), is an almost exact parallel.*

(c) I have not space to deal with the other passages. Dr. Skinner deals with 30[24, 27] and 48[15] (D.N., pp. 54 f., 107). On external grounds we may conclude that Yahweh in 14[22] is a gloss. The Samaritan Pentateuch reads Elohim, which may equally be a gloss. LXX and Peshitta omit. But on internal grounds alone it cannot be said that Yahweh in the mouth of Abram is demonstrably wrong. The other supposed demonstrable inferiorities of the MT prove on examination to be equally inconclusive.]

vii. The LXX " has preserved a very large number of readings that differ greatly from the MT. There is a pre-liminary question to be asked in using versions : does the text really represent a different Hebrew ? If it is due to mistranslation or to desire to make the meaning clearer or to internal corruption, it is of no value for the criticism of the MT." [This is quite true, but Wiener goes on to say :] " This is not the case with at any rate the majority of the readings to be considered, for (a) support for renderings of the versions often comes from one or more Hebrew MSS. or from the Samaritan, or from both. [The answer to this has

* See Driver's note in his *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel,* pp. 13–15.

been given already in this Article, I 1 and 2, and III 1 iv.]
(b) Extant notes as to various readings have come down
to us, showing that LXX readings were supported by other
authorities." [Wiener here refers to the fact that Origen
on Gen. 4^1 & ^{26} quotes 'the Hebrew' and in 4^1 and 12^8
quotes 'the Syrian' as agreeing with the LXX reading
(see Field's *Hexapla*, p. lxxvii.). It is generally supposed
that two unknown translators or commentators are referred
to, but the reference is too obscure to be of any serious
value. Wiener also points to Gen. 30^{24} where Aquila,
Symmachus and the Syriac version agree with the LXX in
reading 'God.' This is the one passage out of thirty-two,
where Aquila deserts the MT in regard to the Divine Names.
It seems to be a case of assimilation of the Divine Name to
the 6 Elohim in the preceding seven verses.]

" For these reasons " (Wiener proceeds) " it is *certain*
that the Versions do, at any rate in the *great majority* of
cases where they differ from the MT, provide us with genuine
Jewish variant readings, and this opens up the question
as to the soundness of the MT with regard to the appella-
tions of God."

[I have italicized three words in the above quotation
from Wiener (*Essays*, p. 16). If Wiener here arrives so
confidently at 'certainty' on such inadequate grounds, and
if he jumps from a few questionable instances to 'the great
majority of cases,' how can we put any dependence on his
confident statements in other respects ?]

Wiener goes on (*Essays*, pp. 17–19) to set forth cases in
which, according to him, the Versional variant is on internal
grounds demonstrably superior to the MT. [These I have
dealt with under § vi. above], and he proceeds : " The
LXX has also in a number of cases preserved readings
demonstrably inferior, but in the great majority of cases
the difference to the sense is nil. It is therefore only

necessary to show that these variants are extraordinarily numerous to cut away the ground from under the feet of the documentary critics."

[In *Essays*, pp. 24, 25 and 35, Wiener lays down Principles of Textual Criticism. Dr. Skinner has dealt with these in *Divine Names* (pp. 160–2 and 244 f.) and, to save space here, I must refer the reader to that book. But, in a word, one may say that the so-called ' principles ' are so laid down as to ' load the dice ' against the MT.]

Wiener in his *Essays* (pp. 26–40) gives a series of *five Tables*, purporting to set forth the ' extraordinarily numerous' variants above mentioned. [I propose to comment on these Tables as briefly as is possible.]

TABLE I (p. 26) gives a list of seven readings in Gen. 2–3, where we know the readings of Origen's *Hexapla*. [Wiener in his *Reply* to Dr. Skinner acknowledges frankly that one of these readings (3^{23}) is non-existent. He had mis-read Field's *Hexapla* and had neglected to consult the Greek text, which would have speedily revealed his error.]

In 3^1 Origen found ' LORD God ' in the LXX text he used, and in this reading the MT and all other authorities agree. In the other five Origen seems to have found God and to have added LORD, but Lucian (according to Lagarde) read ' LORD God ' in two out of the five, and codex A did the same in three. Wiener concludes this section with the question : What do higher critics say to this ? [We have already hinted at what one higher critic has said as to the ' colossal blunder ' in 3^{23}. As to 3^1 MT and LXX agree. In the other five cases the Hexaplaric marks are good evidence as to the unrevised LXX text in Alexandria and Palestine, but the Lucianic and codex A readings shew that other readings may have co-existed in Syria and else-where, and at best the Hexapla only takes us back to A.D. 200 (i.e. 400 to 500 years later than the original LXX), and

at best only gives us the LXX text. It remains to be proved that it is superior to the MT. In every one of these six cases the Samaritan supports the MT.]

TABLE II gives the remaining cases in Gen. 2–3 where the MT has ' LORD God.' Wiener concludes that in four out of the thirteen [rather ' fourteen,' as 3^{23} was wrongly inserted in Table I] " it is absolutely clear that the original LXX text read ' God ' alone." [I agree as to $2^{9, 19, 21}$, but in 3^{13} the evidence is fairly evenly divided between LORD God (= MT) and God. That leaves *ten* passages where LXX and MT agree, the variants in each case being negligible.]

TABLE III gives a select list of variants from Gen. 4 onwards. At its close Wiener remarks : " Probably few will doubt that in the great majority of the passages cited in this Table the LXX originally had a reading different from our present MT. [In estimating the significance of this Table it is important to keep in mind that the total separate uses of the Divine Names as proper nouns in the MT of Genesis and Exodus to 3^{14} are 324, and that the total *selected* examples in this Table amount to 43, i.e. just over one eighth. Of these I agree that 29, i.e. two-thirds, are clear LXX readings ; 10 more are doubtful ; the remaining four ought not to have been included at all, for one (15^2) is an Adonai Yahweh passage, and in three ($31^{42 \& 53}$, 48^{15}) Elohim is used appellatively.]

TABLE IV gives twenty-one cases where LXX variants with very little authority in Greek are supported by Hebrew MSS. [Four of these should be eliminated. $15^{2 \& 8}$ are both Adonai Yahweh passages, which, as we have seen (Art. 3 I 1), are notoriously liable to error. 6^{13} and 7^{16} are mere scribal errors.] " These coincidences," says Wiener, " are too numerous to be due to chance. In every case where any LXX authority presents a reading that differs from the

MT without any reason for supposing that the variant reading originated in the Greek, there is primâ facie evidence for suspecting a Hebrew variant." [We have already seen that coincidences were bound to occur when the possible variations were so extremely limited (III 1 iv above), and also that, except in the passages where Adonai or Adonai Yahweh occur, no single Hebrew variant is supported by more than three Hebrew MSS. (Art. 3 I 1). As a matter of fact in Wiener's Table only three Hebrew variants (after eliminating $15^{2, 8}$) are read by as many as two Hebrew MSS.

But the most important criticism of Wiener's contention is that if the same Hebrew MS. (or MSS.) presented a series of variant readings and was (were) supported by at least one or two LXX MSS. consistently, the coincidence would certainly point to an independent recension, but as a matter of fact the very opposite is the case. Eliminating the four passages, 6^{13}, 7^{16}, $15^{2, 8}$ (as above), 18 Hebrew MSS. are left. Only one of these appears more than once in the remaining list and, in the three variants this one shews, it never has support from more than one LXX cursive and in each case a different one. The LXX MSS. are almost equally various.

The verdict of impartial minds must surely be that the coincidences are due to chance. The two cases (3^{22} and 19^{29}) in which one Hebrew MS. (a different one in each case) coincides with a well-supported LXX reading are far too few to justify any conclusion to the contrary, and the sweeping generalization which Wiener deduces from his Table IV is seen to be built on the sand.]

TABLE V presents " all the variants of any consequence in a couple of selected passages " " in order to make it quite clear how frequently the reading is precarious." [The first passage is Gen. 6^9–9^{17}. Wiener gives 17 variants.

F

Wiener omits 6[9], 8[1a,b], 9[6], because there are no variants in these cases, MT and LXX both reading ' God ' unanimously, but by including them we get a more complete understanding of the whole case.   This makes the total uses 21.   Of these 21, 16 LXX readings are clear (eight agreeing with the MT, three adding LORD to the MT God, and five adding God to the MT LORD).   It will be noted that out of these sixteen clear readings eight agree with the MT and the other eight are readings of LORD God.   Now on p. 35 Wiener tells us that " LORD God in an enormous number of passages is a conflate reading."   If that be true, then the conclusion seems obvious that the latter readings do not give the readings of the original and that in these cases also the MT readings have at least a very strong presumption in their favour.   The remaining five LXX readings are doubtful, the variants equivalent to the MT being strongly supported, but balanced by other authorities in favour of one or other or both of the possible alternatives.

The second passage selected by Wiener is chapter 17. Here his singling out ' all the variants of any consequence ' is arbitrarily applied and can only mislead anyone who does not carefully compare his presentation with the chapter itself. He omits verses [3,9] and [22b] because there are practically no variants, but verses [22a] and [23] should be mentioned alongside [18] and [19].   Verse [15] has already appeared under Table IV.   But the outstanding fact is that throughout the whole chapter the overwhelming majority of LXX authorities are in agreement with the MT, and the evidence for the four variants tabled is so flimsy as to be not worth notice. The conclusion seems obvious that the MT throughout preserves the original text.   But not so Wiener.   Let him but find one Hebrew and one LXX cursive, even sometimes one alone (as in 17[18]) and he is at once convinced that here is at least sufficient evidence to render the MT quite ' pre-

carious.' What he has unintentionally shewn is that, if any Text is precarious, it is the LXX Text. It in no way follows that therefore the MT is precarious. But now, fresh from our study of Table V, let us listen to Wiener's summing up of the argument, as given in his *Essays* (pp. 40–41).

" For sheer worthlessness as a test of authorship the use of the Divine Appellations by the MT would be difficult to surpass." " The MT is in some cases demonstrably wrong ; in an enormous proportion of other cases it is quite uncertain."

A writer who, after setting forth textual evidence after the manner of Table V, could append the above, can hardly be said to exhibit that ' accuracy, care, thoroughness and impartiality ' which he himself declares to be ' essential elements in scholarship,' and for the asserted absence of which he sets down all the critics with whom he disagrees as ' not scholars.' *

When one looks at the record of the witness upon which, in the main, Wiener so touchingly relies and observes how constantly its own text is unreliable or, on his principles, precarious and open to doubt, one is tempted to reply : " for sheer worthlessness as a witness to the original Hebrew Text of Genesis, where it differs from the MT, the LXX would be difficult to surpass. The LXX is in some cases demonstrably wrong ; in a large number of other cases it is quite uncertain." But there is no need to use exaggerated language. Let us rather recognize that in some 266 passages in Gen. 1–Ex. 3^{15} the LXX clearly confirms the MT.†￼ Here we have a broad basis of agreement. What about the remaining 78 or (if we include the 9 (? 11) additional Divine Names in the LXX) 87 (? 89) passages ? Certainly we cannot accept them in bulk. " It is no part

* *Essays*, p. 1.   † See above, II 2, pp. 65–66.

of my contention," writes Wiener, " that the LXX is always
right and the MT always wrong. . . . Neither line of
transmission is infallible." *   The LXX variant readings
are certainly not better *per se*.

It is indeed notorious that the LXX contains many
readings which presuppose a quite impossible Hebrew Text.
In such books as Samuel, Kings and Ezekiel, the MT of
which is in a far less perfect state than in the Pentateuch,
emendations are frequently made from the LXX, but only
when some superiority, real or fancied, attaches to the Text
which appears to underlie the LXX reading.   Unfortunately
in the case of the Divine Names the test of intrinsic value
in the ordinary sense fails us.   Neither sense nor grammar
is affected by the substitution of one name for another.
The attempt to bolster up the witness of the LXX by
adducing coincidences with stray variants in Hebrew MSS.
completely breaks down.†   Even in particular chosen
cases, the LXX readings are not demonstrably better on
internal grounds.‡   And when we examine the 87 passages
in detail we find Wiener's " enormous proportion of cases "
in which the MT is " quite uncertain " shrinks to very small
proportions indeed.   Mr. Wiener has given us five Tables.
Let me give one in their place.

TABLE OF LXX VARIATIONS FROM THE MT. §

5 *omissions*. These do not affect the analysis at all.

25 *doubtful*. In 24 of these there is a well-supported variant agree-
ing with the MT.   In the 25th (4⁹) the LXX authorities are
divided between LORD God and God, the double name
suggesting an original LORD as in the MT.

20 *LORD God*, 16 times for MT Yahweh, 4 for Elohim.   It is
practically certain that all these readings are due to editors

---

* *Reply* to Dr. Skinner, p. 39.

† See Part III 1 iv at the end of the September instalment.

‡ See § vi, above.

§ References to chapter and verse will be found in the footnotes to the
Table in the first part of this Article, II 3 (September, p. 66).

or copyists, and the strong probability is that in all these cases the MT gives us the earlier text.

4 *LORD* for MT Elohim. All 4 occur in passages in which the two Divine Names are commingled. In all 4, if we may judge by phraseological links with JE on the one hand and with P on the other, the probability is that the editor who combined JE and P retained the Divine Names as used in these documents (so MT), and that Greek translators or copyists, consciously or unconsciously, assimilated the names in these 4 cases to that which was prevalent in the context.

24 *God* (a) in 5 cases for MT LORD God. Why in Gen. $2^{5, 7, 9, 19, 21}$ the LXX reads God and, side by side with these, reads LORD God in $2^{8, 15, 16, 18, 22}$ no one, so far as I know, has ever been able to explain on any rational ground. The MT at least is consistent, the LXX is not. (b) In 19 cases for Yahweh. Prof. Welch early in his article of May, 1923, quoted the second Book of Psalms as a proof that an editor or editors had deliberately changed Yahweh into Elohim in at least some of the Psalms in that Book (see Art. 3, p. 165). "Now," he went on, "since we do not know when the change was made and have no certain clue to the reasons which led to the change, it is impossible to say that such an alteration of the Divine Names could only be expected in the Psalter. It may have influenced, if not the writers, at least the copyists, of the stories in Genesis." By 'It' I suppose Welch means : 'The same tendency.' If so, what he says is quite true. It may have. But, if so, what follows ? Where do we find a similar tendency to change Yahweh into Elohim ? Not in the MT of Gen. 1^1–Ex. 3^{15} but in the LXX. In the MT there are 146 occurrences of Yahweh. In the same passages we find in the LXX 93 occurrences of *Κύριος*, 16 of *Κύριος ὁ Θεός*, 19 of *ὁ Θεός*, 17 doubtful and 1 omission. It is clear that, if the Second Book of Psalms is to be our guide, so far from pointing to the MT, it points to the LXX, as the document in which the changes have been made.

78

9 *additions* * (7 of *Θεός*, 2 of *Κύριος*). These leave the analysis practically unaffected. Eight of the names are similar to

* Gen. $1^{7, 8}$, 4^{10}, 31^{44b}, 35^9, 43^{28}, 50^{24c} (2^2 and Ex. 3^{12a} are also possible) ; 16^8, 19^{24d}.

those which prevail in the passages in which they occur. The ninth (*Κύριον* in Gen. 19²⁹ᵈ) harmonizes with the LXX reading in 19²⁹ᵃ. The two stand or fall together.

87

The above detailed examination of the whole number of clear and doubtful divergencies from the MT readings shews how unsatisfactory " an enormous proportion " of them are, if the aim is to recover the original Hebrew Text. I submit that on " cross-examination " (to use Welch's word) the case against the MT, based on the LXX evidence, has broken down. I now propose to adduce :

3. Some positive evidence in favour of the MT.

A good deal has been done in the last twenty years to demonstrate the reliability of the MT.

i. For example, Joh. Herrmann has written a very interesting paper on the Divine Names in the Book of Ezekiel, in which he has shewn that Ezekiel's usage can be reduced to a few simple and easily intelligible rules, and that with insignificant exceptions these rules are strictly observed in the MT.* The few exceptions (17 out of 447) clearly are transcriptional errors. On the other hand the LXX renders Adonai Yahweh in 5 different ways, including 143 *Κύριος* only. Clearly the MT has strictly adhered to the usage of Ezekiel and the LXX has not.

ii. The usage of the Divine Names in Job is equally in favour of the MT.* In the MT the name Yahweh in the Dialogue is carefully avoided (the only exception, 12⁹, occurs in a probable interpolation) and archaic names for God are almost exclusively employed, whereas in the prose introduction and epilogue and in the headings of speeches Yahweh is employed 30 times. In the LXX on the other hand the distinction of usage between the two parts is

* See Dr. Skinner's *Divine Names in Genesis*, notes on pp. 174–176 and 292–293.

obliterated and *Κύϱιος* is used 102 times in an indiscriminate manner.

iii. Baumgärtel (for whom see Art. 1, Supplementary note) draws attention to " one point to which too little attention is paid by those who put forward ' text-critical ' misgivings : viz. that from inner-Massoretic observations it is possible to draw conclusions as to the textual certainty or uncertainty of the MT. And inner-Massoretic investigations must be undertaken. I would refer to the . . . irrefutable thesis of Herrmann regarding the Divine Names in Ezekiel. On inner-Massoretic grounds he has convincingly shewn the originality of the MT in the Adonai Yahweh passages." I think all competent scholars will agree with Baumgärtel in this. Nothing exposes the shallowness of Wiener's and Dahse's judgment more clearly than the way in which they set aside Herrmann's cogent arguments and facts and substitute a theory that the Hebrew editor of Ezekiel decided to use an almost equal number of Adonai Yahweh (217 and 218 respectively). It is true that no one could possibly have realized this, who didn't actually connect the names, and that no motive is conceivable which could have led any sane man to propose to himself so futile an artificiality, but that does not prevent their jumping at any theory which will give a semblance of excuse for preferring the LXX to the MT.

iv. In exactly the same way these two men take their stand upon Hontheim's arithmetical calculations in Genesis.* Anything more absolutely artificial and motiveless than the supposed methods of the Hebrew editor it would be impossible to imagine, and yet Wiener, while not accepting all Hontheim's calculations, declares that in his opinion the theory as a whole accounts for the difference between

---

* For Hontheim's theory see Skinner's *Divine Names*, pp. 292–294.

the MT and the LXX.* This judgment carries its own condemnation on the face of it.

v. Let me quote Baumgärtel again. "Looking back on the foregoing investigation as a whole, it can safely be affirmed that the use of Elohim in the present MT is not irregular or planless—that on the contrary it has been possible to establish a certain *normality* (Gesetzmässigkeit) in the use of Elohim (although I would not press the expression ' normality ') : here and there it may be questionable, but in the main it exists beyond a doubt. This normality however can only be recognized, if the MT has not arisen through alterations, but lies before us as original text. If the MT were the result of alterations, this normality must be ascribed to the alterations, which in that case must have been systematic, extending over all the books passed under review. That is impossible. The normality can only be established on the assumption that the MT has not effaced the fact by alterations, but has faithfully transmitted the Divine Names. Thus for the trustworthiness of the MT in regard to the Divine Names we obtain a general point of view of essential importance : that this result is not to be mechanically applied to individual passages goes without saying."

vi. This normality in the use of the Divine Names in the MT does not stand alone. In both the first and second of these Articles we have noted the very significant fact that in Gen. 1¹–Ex. 6² the names Yahweh and Elohim closely coincide with the passages which on grounds of dual narrative, style and outlook have been grouped together into the three series known as J, E and P. This can be seen even in the LXX text from Gen. 12 onwards. It comes out more clearly and consistently in the MT. This coincidence speaks volumes for the trustworthiness of

* Wiener's *Reply, Bibliotheca Sacra,* p. 255.

the MT and the soundness of the documentary theory.

vii. It is equally significant that the Samaritan Pentateuch, Aquila, the Peshitta and the Vulgate (see Part I of this article) support the MT almost unanimously, shewing such a mere handful of divergencies that the only wonder is that, during such centuries of transcription, the number of them is so small.

viii. It remains to ask : if we do not accept the generality of the variant LXX readings as representing the original Hebrew text, how can we account for them ?

In Gen. 12¹–Ex. 6² these readings may be reasonably regarded as errors:

(*a*) Arising naturally during the long series of transmissions ;

(*b*) Due possibly in some cases to the unintelligent substitution of what editors or scribes believed to be the better reading.

In comparison with the Jews and the Samaritans the Greek copyists were somewhat careless ; the assimilation of a name to others in the context was all too easy ; but probably the main reason why ' God ' was substituted for LORD so much more frequently than LORD for God was simply that God came much more readily to the pen of a Greek scribe than the Hebraic LORD. In Gen. 2–11 the case is somewhat different. The divergencies are much more numerous. Here the hand of the Greek editor may have been at work. The reading LORD God occurs almost exclusively in these chapters and, as Dr. Skinner pointed out in his *Divine Names*, if the first of the two names represents the original in agreement with the MT, then the proportion of LXX variants to the MT readings in these chapters comes very fairly near to the proportion in Gen. 12–50. The MT usage is so strikingly confirmed by other criteria that it seems reasonable to regard some

of the 18 occurrences of LORD God and some other variations
as consciously made, and the other variants as in ' nearly,'
if not quite, all cases due to transcriptional error.

If the preceding considerations are duly weighed, the
conclusion which will commend itself to judicial minds
must surely be that the attack made upon the reliability
of the MT in the matter of the Divine Names in Gen.
1-Ex. 6 has failed. The claim made that the witness
of the LXX, where it differs from the MT, should outweigh
the witnesses on the other side has not been substantiated.
On the contrary the unreliability of the LXX text has been
shewn and the substantial accuracy of the MT has been
brought out. So far from the basis of the whole docu-
mentary theory having been " seriously shaken," it stands
unshaken and I believe unshakable.

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS OF ARTICLE.

B. The second main position of the regnant hypothesis.
    i. What do we mean by ' Deuteronomy ' ?
    ii. Its distinctive style and phraseology.
    iii. Its date.　Four theories.

  I. Mosaic authorship in all essentials.　Orr, etc.
    Two specimen difficulties.
      i. Nu. 26–36 compared with Deuteronomy.
      ii. The Code itself—its lack of order, its actual laws.

 II. Deuteronomy in the main is Josiah's Book of the Covenant.
    De Wette, etc.
    i. Based on early laws, but compiled between 700 and
      621 B.C.
    ii. Demands centralisation.　*The Religion of Israel under
      the Kingdom.*

III. Deuteronomy belongs to the exilic or early post-exilic period.
    1. Hölscher.
      i. Centralisation impracticable under Josiah.
      ii. Was it impracticable ?　Size of Josiah's kingdom.
    2. Kennett.
      i. The book the result of a religious unification of
        Judah and Samaria during the captivity.
      ii. Criticism of a specimen point—' all Israel.'
      iii. Relation of Jeremiah to Deuteronomy.

IV. Deuteronomic Law belongs to the early monarchy, but with
    later additions—Welch.
    1. Early character of the legislation.　Aim not centralisa-
      tion.
    2. Three difficulties.
      i. The phrase ' the place which Yahweh shall choose.'
      ii. Chap. 12^{1-7}.
      iii. 2 Kings 22–23.
    3. Two illustrations.
      i. Law of Passover.
      ii. Stones and altar on Mt. Ebal.
Conclusion.　The second main position, with minor modifications,
    still stands.

Article 4.   DEUTERONOMY.

IN the preceding Articles we have followed Prof. Welch's lead (EXPOSITOR, May, 1923) and concentrated our attention on the literary analysis of the Pentateuch, with special reference to Gen. 1¹–Ex. 6². We left on one side the collateral question as to the dates of the three documents, J, E and P.   If we are still to follow the same lead, we must now to some extent reverse this procedure and, in regard to Deuteronomy, give large attention to the question of the date of publication.   According to Welch, "the second main position of ' the regnant hypothesis ' is that the book of Deuteronomy, if not in its present, at least in its original, form, was first brought to light in 621 under King Josiah, when it was used as the basis for an effort at reform in the national religion.   As such, it marked a new departure in the religious life of Judah, especially in connection with the concentration of worship at the Temple at Jerusalem.   Certain of its main contentions were therefore wholly novel in the Kingdom."   This position, Welch says, has been "seriously shaken."   Exception must be taken to the last sentence of this statement.*   I have, however, at this stage only one criticism to make, but it is a far-reaching one, viz. that this statement singles out the question of the date of publication and treats that as though it were the main issue, whereas the really fundamental position is that Deuteronomy stands, so to speak, midway between JE and P.   This position has been arrived at as the result of a laborious comparison of D with JE and P in respect of (a) narratives and (b) laws and is untouched by any of the attempt which have been made of late to cast doubt upon the

---

* See Driver on Deut., p. lvi.

exact nature of the relation of Deuteronomy to the Reform under Josiah.

How intricate is the problem raised by Deuteronomy may be seen in the fact that intelligent men have put forward the most diverse solutions. The book has been regarded as belonging to the time of (1) Moses, (2) the early Kings, (3) King Josiah, (4) the Exile or after. Only by setting aside presuppositions, distinguishing what we have good evidence for from speculative inferences, and seeking to do justice to all the data, can we hope to arrive at a true solution. In this spirit let us take up the study of Deuteronomy once more and see how far the different theories explain the phenomena we find therein.

At the outset let us clear our minds as to what we mean by Deuteronomy. The only legitimate meaning is the whole book as we now have it. The moment that we accept this we are faced by the fact that there are portions of the book, which on all hands are recognized as late. Prof. Orr writes in the interests of Mosaic authorship, but he says : " It is not disputed that, in the form in which we have it, the book shows signs of editorial redaction. The discourses are put together with introductory and connecting notes (which however differ little in style from the rest of the work) and the last part of the work with its account of Moses' death and in one or two places what seem unmistakable indications of JE and P hands (in chapters 31, 32 and 34) point clearly to such redaction." *
If Orr had remembered that " Deuteronomy " meant the whole book would he have characterized as " remarkable " and " paradoxical " Dr. Driver's statement that " Deuteronomy does not claim to have been written by Moses " ? The man who writes consistently about Moses in the third

* *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 251.

person * is the man who alone can be called 'the author.'
The material he uses may or may not be Mosaic, but the
book itself (apart from small P additions) is by him and
not by Moses.   Moreover, if it proves to be true that the
Priestly document is post-exilic, then "unmistakable
indications of the Priestly hand" bring Deuteronomy, as
we now have it, down to a date later than the Exile.

Not only is Deuteronomy, as we now have it, admittedly
late, but its style and phraseology are generally recognized as
marking it off from the rest of the Pentateuch.   "There are,"
writes Orr, "marked differences between the Deuteronomic
and the JE and P styles.†   He quotes with approval Driver's
remark that " particular words and phrases recur with extra-
ordinary frequency, giving a distinctive colouring to every
part of the work."‡   The fact that this "distinctive colour-
ing" runs through practically the whole book points to the
conclusion that the speeches, as well as the narratives, are the
composition of the author (or authors).   This would be in
accordance with the literary usage of the Hebrew his-
torians.§   Orr does not agree with this inference, but he says
justly : " the composition of a book of exhortation or instruc-
tion in the form of addresses by Moses—provided this is only
a literary dress—is not *a priori* to be ruled out as in-
admissible or incompatible with just views of Scripture." ||
It is when we come to the question of the dates of com-
pilation and 'publication' that we find acute controversy
raging to-day.

---

* See 1^5, 4^{41-49}, 5^1, $27^{1, 9, 11}$, $29^{1, 2}$, 31^{1-30}.   † Orr, *Problem*, p. 253.

‡ Driver, *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. lxxvii. and see list of seventy
of the more noticeable words or phrases, pp. lxxviii.-lxxxiv.   Note also
Orr, as quoted above, the "introductory and connecting notes . . . differ
little in style from the rest of the work."

§ See Driver, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 90.

|| *The Problem*, p. 249.   He adds a footnote : " Ecclesiastes, e.g., put
into the mouth of Solomon, is generally admitted, even by conservative
critics, to be a work of this kind."

The competitive theories are four in number.

I. There are those who still stand valiantly for the Mosaic authorship in all essential respects, whilst admitting that there has been subsequent editorial revision and annotation.* In the short space available, the utmost I can do is to set forth just two points as specimens of the phenomena which to my mind rule out the hypothesis that Moses wrote the addresses and laws practically as we now have them.

i. Numb. 26–36 professes to give us judgments and instructions delivered by Moses in the plains of Moab in the fortieth year after the Exodus in and after the sixth month.† Deut. professes to give us " the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond Jordan . . . in the fortieth year in the eleventh month . . . in the land of Moab " (1¹⁻⁵). When we compare these two groups of discourses, professedly delivered by the same man within six months of one another, we cannot fail to be struck by the extraordinary difference in vocabulary,‡ in outlook and situation § and in legislation.‖ It seems impossible to accept the view that both come from the same man.

ii. This by itself does not necessarily prove that Deuteronomy is not Mosaic in its main contents, because it may be Numbers which is the later document (as in fact " the

* See, e.g., James Orr, *The Problem of the Old Testament* (Nisbet, 1905) ; a smaller book on Deuteronomy alone by J. S. Griffiths, *The Problem of Deuteronomy* (S.P.C.K., 1911) ; H. M. Wiener, *The Main Problem of Deuteronomy* (Elliot Stock, 1920, reprinted from the *Bibliotheca Sacra*) ; etc.

† See Nu. 20¹, ²² with 33³⁶⁻³⁸, 22¹, 26³, ⁶³, 33⁵⁰, 36¹³.

‡ E.g., ' congregation,' mâṭṭĕh (tribe), and ' princes of the congregation ' (prince 61 times in the Hebrew) in Numbers become in Deuteronomy ' assembly,' shĕvĕt (tribe), ' heads ' (of tribes) and ' elders.'

§ E.g., the position of Levites (Nu. 35¹⁻⁸, Deut. 12¹², ¹⁸⁻¹⁹, 18¹⁻², ⁶) and Priests (Ex. 28–30, Nu. 3 and 8, and Deut. 18¹⁻⁸) ; cp. the story of the Spies (Deut. 1²²⁻⁴⁶, agreeing with JE and not with P in Nu. 13).

‖ E.g., the cities of refuge (Nu. 35⁹⁻³⁴, Deut. 19¹⁻¹³), etc.

regnant hypothesis" believes it to be), but if now we examine the Deuteronomic code itself (chaps. 12–26), we find it very different from what we should expect, if it were a code drawn up in advance by Moses in anticipation of their entrance into the promised land. (*a*) It shews few traces of any attempt to treat subjects for legislation in any intelligible order. This is the portion of the book which Welch has examined afresh in *The Code of Deuteronomy*, and we may cordially accept his demonstration of the heterogeneous assortment of much of the material.* (*b*) Many of its regulations seem clearly to deal with problems which could only have arisen after settlement in the land.† If we had received this code or compilation of laws by itself and had to decide its nature from internal evidence, I believe that we should come unanimously to the conclusion that it was not the original work of a single mind and elaborated at one time, but rather a compilation of laws due originally to various minds, dealing with the various heterogeneous problems which cropped up through a considerable period of time.‡

II. From the time of De Wette onwards scholars have with general agreement identified the original form of Deuteronomy with "the book of the law" found by Hilkiah in the house of the LORD in the days of King Josiah. "There is no reason to doubt," wrote Orr, "that the book which called forth this reformation embraced, if it did not entirely consist of, the Book of Deuteronomy.§ Undoubtedly the writer of 2 Kings 22–23 regards Deuter-

* *Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 12, 23, 136, 185 (' The code has no order '), 189.

† E.g., how to deal with a dead body discovered in open country (Deut. 21¹⁻⁹, see *Code of Deuteronomy*, p. 144).

‡ For fuller discussion, see, e.g., A. H. McNeile, *Deuteronomy, its Place in Revelation* (Longman, 1912), and D. C. Simpson, *Pentateuchal Criticism*, Chap. V (2nd Edition, Oxf. Univ. Press, 1924).

§ *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 257.

onomy (in whole or in part) as the book which was read before Josiah. A long list of parallels can be drawn up, shewing the close connection between the two.*

Based upon this identification with "the book of the law" and upon the internal evidence of the Book itself, the regnant hypothesis has taught that the *compiling* of the regulations in Deut. 12–26 probably took place at some time in the reign of Manasseh, Amon or Josiah. Dr. Welch writes as if the fact "that the book of Deuteronomy as a whole has a history, and that inside the book the groups of laws, even the individual laws, have a history," were a novel idea only now coming to light. "The application of this fact," he says, "*will* have a far-reaching influence on the attitude which must be taken up to the reform under Josiah." † But this fact has been a commonplace of criticism for many years. "Criticism," wrote Bishop Ryle in 1898, "has clearly revealed and strenuously reiterated that Dt. contains and expounds laws of very much greater antiquity than its own compilation." ‡ Twenty-five years ago Carpenter and Harford put it thus. After speaking (1) of the "pervading unity of thought and style," they said : "(2) the unity thus implied includes beneath it great diversity both of contents and expression . . . (3) the probability that the Deuteronomic legislation contains elements from various sources is increased by the evidence of the co-existence of different forms of the same law side by side, and the occasional blending of separate regulations into one. . . . It is probably to the derivation of the laws from various shorter collections that the occasional separation of precepts on related subjects is to be ascribed."

* For such a list see Driver, *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. xlv.

† Article in EXPOSITOR, May, 1923, p. 356. The use of italics is mine, not Prof. Welch's.

‡ Article on Deuteronomy in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. i, p. 603.

Finally under (4) the authors shew that among the "different sources" must be reckoned "the collections of both Judah and Ephraim" (for "many laws are plainly related to regulations in JE and P^h"), "very ancient usage and custom" and "some corpus of priestly law." * Driver expressed similar views.†

Welch has admirably brought out the antiquity of many laws, such as "the expiation of undiscovered murder," but in so doing he has merely dotted the ' i's ' and crossed the ' t's ' of previous scholars. And these same scholars have long ago pointed out the legitimate applications of these facts. They would cordially accept as their own almost every word of Welch's statement in his EXPOSITOR Article (p. 357) : "Deuteronomy only gathered into one code and submitted to one aim what had slowly been forming itself in Israel as the true way of worshipping Yahweh and of living under His control. . . . Much of what took place under Josiah may have been the selection and arrangement of the best law in the past and its issue under the authority of the national leaders." The only difference between Welch, as he now stands, and the men whom he criticizes is as to the nature of the "one aim" and how it was proposed that it should be carried out. Let us see what the difference is. The view of the exponents of the regnant hypothesis could not be better expressed than by Welch in his earlier book, *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom.* "Deuteronomy insists upon two special reforms . . . really corollaries from its fundamental principle and the means of making this dominate the actual life of the people. The first was the *nationalisation* of worship ; the

* *Oxford Hexateuch*, vol. ii, pp. 267–8. The whole note on Deut. 12[1] should be carefully read.

† *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 90 and 93 (6th Edition) and *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, pp. lvi.–lxii.

second was its *centralisation* at Jerusalem. What I mean by the nationalisation of the worship is that a deliberate effort was made to suppress the *local* sacrifices of clan and family and with this end in view it was determined that private sacrifices should only be permitted at the *central* sanctuary. But it does more than merely forbid. It provides the great Festivals . . . with motives taken from the history of Yahweh's dealings with His people. The people when they come together to worship their God are to come to a shrine which has associations with their national worship and with that alone." The aim of Deuteronomy was "a truly national worship"; the means was "the centralisation of the cult." This central-isation "was at first a piece of *practical* legislation."*

In *The Code of Deuteronomy* the second part of this position is abandoned, and abandoned by reason of the formulation of a new view of Deuteronomy as having been first compiled during the Exile.

III. The theory that Deuteronomy was compiled during the Exile has been championed by Prof. Hölscher of Mar-burg and Prof. Kennett of Cambridge, working on quite independent lines.

1. Prof. Hölscher published a long article in the *Z.A.W.*, 1921,† in which he set himself to prove that Deuteronomy was not the programme of the reform in 621 B.C., but its product. He argues that many of the laws—about the tithe, about the harvest-festivals, about the firstlings—lay down regulations which no man could obey, when Jerusalem was made the sole legitimate shrine. But sane men, face to face with the conditions of their own time, would not

---

* *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom* (T. & T. Clark, 1912), pp. 207–212. Certain words in the above quotations are italicized by me in order to bring out the points at issue.

† See also *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 16–18 and passim (see Index).

demand impossibilities. Therefore these laws are not the work of legislators in Josiah's time ; they are the dreams of exilic priests, obsessed with the idea that centralization was the way to religious health for the nation. They never stopped to ask themselves whether these laws were practicable. The laws about the king and about war were equally impracticable.

Welch rejects the conclusion, but he accepts the premiss. Whereas in 1912 he spoke of centralisation as " a piece of practical legislation," he now bases his own theory about Deuteronomy upon the same conviction that the requirement that firstfruits and tithes must be brought to, and festivals and sacrifices kept at, Jerusalem was quite impracticable. But is this so ? Take, for example, Welch's argument in connection with the Passover law in chap. 16^{1-8} that the regulation that the flesh of the Passover must be cooked and eaten in the evening and that at sunrise the worshippers must return home " must have made it peculiarly difficult and even impossible to observe, when the cult was centralised at Jerusalem." * Why ' impossible ' ? Because of the distance from their own homes ? In the first place the difference was not great in Josiah's time. As Welch says : " In the period of Josiah Israel had practically become the city of Jerusalem with its dependent towns." † The great majority of the people probably lived within one, or at the outside two, days' journey from Jerusalem. In the second place, however far distant the home was, there could be no difficulty in sacrificing and eating on the appointed evening and turning homeward the next morning. The law doesn't say that

---

* *The Code*, pp. 66–67, and cp. p. 72.

† *The Code*, p. 147. Cp. Kennett (*Camb. Biblical Essays*, p. 103) in reference to the earlier reformation : " The law of the One Sanctuary had been possible in the very small kingdom which Sennacherib had left to Josiah's great-grandfather Hezekiah."

they must all reach home the day they started back. But if not, where is the difficulty ? Is it not purely imaginary. The same ignoring of the restricted area of the Southern Kingdom in Josiah's time leads Hölscher to declare it impossible for the entire household to come to Jerusalem for the feast of harvest. Akin to this is the same writer's argument that it was quite impracticable to legislate that the entire population (which he puts at 120,000) should come up to Jerusalem at one time. But Deuteronomy lays down no fixed dates for the Festivals and if, as Welch has well insisted we should do,* we avoid ' reading into the Deuteronomic laws ' what is only laid down in later laws, the difficulty disappears. It is quite gratuitous to lay down that " centralisation . . . inevitably led to the appointment of one common date for the day." † It seems in fact only to require common sense to solve the various impracticabilities, which both Hölscher and Welch see in the laws, as soon as they are read as demanding attendance at Jerusalem.‡

2. Prof. Kennett for the last twenty years has put forward, in a succession of Articles,§ a similar theory as to the late date of Deuteronomy, but has based it on quite other grounds.

i. He objects, e.g., to a date in or before 621 B.C. on such grounds as (a) that this does not account for the fact that the Law of Holiness (Lev. 17) makes far less concession in respect of the slaying of animals for food than does Deut. 12, or for the fact that Jeremiah seventeen years after 621 B.C. declared that the Mosaic Law was not concerned with burnt-

---

* *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 77–82, 37, 61–4.

† *The Code of Deuteronomy*, p. 81. Surely here Welch transgresses his own dictum.

‡ See the ' Conclusion ' of this Article.

§ Articles in *J.T.S.*, Jan., 1905, and July, 1906 ; and in *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, pp. 99–135 ; and *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue* (Camb. Univ. Press, 1920).

offering and sacrifice ; and (b) that it does not provide any suitable occasion for the combination of North Israelite (E) and Judæan (J) legend and law. He suggests that the actual compilation of J may be traced to the reactionary prophetic party after the reformation of Josiah.

" Jeremiah's emphatic denial (7^{22}) that the law given to Israel at the Exodus was concerned with burnt-offering or sacrifice " would be " inexplicable, if J had been generally accepted as canonical for any length of time." In fact Kennett would understand " a lying pen of scribes had wrought falsely " (Jer. 8^8) as directed against J * with its stories of the patriarch's building altars in various places. A similar process was carried out by the priests of Bethel, ' a revised code of law being compiled with a body of traditions concerning the fathers of the race ' (E). After the carrying away of all the priests and Levites from Jerusalem (597–586 B.C.), probably Jerusalem and Bethel joined forces, the Aaronite priests from Bethel came to Jerusalem and the two documents J and E were combined into one. " But the document so ingeniously put together was nevertheless inadequate. It contained no explicit statement of the law of the One Sanctuary and indeed made reference to a plurality of altars." A new effort was therefore made " to provide a basis of reunion for all Israel," and the result was Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy was clearly intended to supersede JE and therefore must be distinctly later. It was probably completed before the rebuilding of the temple under Zerubbabel (520–515 B.C.). Chapters 1–11 are the production of disciples of Jeremiah, who effected a compromise between Jeremiah's denunciation of all sacrifice and the reformed sacrifices of the Deuteronomic party.

---

* Marti and others regard it as directed against Deuteronomy, but Skinner, as against both, points out that it is more probably directed, not against the law itself, but against scribal developments, which falsified the true inwardness of the law (*Prophecy and Religion*, pp. 103–5).

2 Kings 22–23 cannot in his opinion be quoted against him, because the author, if 23^{25-27} comes from his pen, wrote after the Captivity had begun, i.e. at least thirty-five years after the events of 621 B.C., probably much later, and therefore the details of his account may be based not upon actual personal knowledge or even upon actual documents, but upon a belief that Josiah must have acted upon Deuteronomic law. N.B.—If Deuteronomy was not completed until near the days of Zerubbabel, this brings 2 Kings down to at least one hundred years after Josiah.

ii. The argument is extremely ingenious and needs to be read as a whole to be fully appreciated. It consists of a large number of subtle inferences and assumptions and my feeling is that in many cases they rest upon very slender foundations. Take for example his initial argument in *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, pp. 4 and 5. "If," he says, "Deuteronomy was the book found in the Temple—assuming that a book of tôrā was actually found there—either it had just been written with a view to the existing situation, or it had been composed some time before, but events had made it impossible to put it into practice. Both these hypotheses are however excluded by what we know of the history of Judah and Israel; for, whereas Deuteronomy is clearly addressed to ' *all* Israel ' (1^1, etc.), Josiah had jurisdiction only over Judah, and neither he nor any other Judæan of his time could have legislated for Samaria. . . . A like difficulty precludes the alternative supposition that Deuteronomy was written at an earlier date . . . for . . . the circumstances of Hezekiah's reign were not favourable to legislation for *all* Israel." For the same reason Kennett goes on (pp. 5–7) to urge that " a mere enumeration of the outstanding features of the Deuteronomic law is sufficient to disprove the idea that it could have arisen in the days of Manasseh or Hezekiah or at an

earlier date." The argument here assumes that the Deuteronomic writer (or writers) was himself seeking to address, or legislate for, ' all Israel,' but it is surely obvious that, as he is professing to tell what Moses said to the assembled tribes in the plains of Moab, ' all Israel ' is appropriate to that situation and that therefore the phrase cannot be relied on as evidencing who were the body of people whom the Deuteronomist was aiming at reaching in his own day. He may reasonably be regarded as having in view the actual people who were then in close touch with Jerusalem.

iii. The relation of Jeremiah to Deuteronomy was regarded as clear twenty-five years ago. " Jeremiah," wrote Driver, " is the earliest prophet who can be demonstrated to have been acquainted with Deuteronomy." * But Kennett devotes six pages of one of his articles † to the consideration of this subject and claims that he has at least demonstrated the possibility that Deuteronomy draws many phrases from the prophet and not *vice versa*. Welch makes a similar effort in the opposite direction, trying to shew that Deuteronomy (esp. 26^{1-11}) may have preceded Hosea (chap. 2). ‡ It is impossible in this Article to go into the arguments. I must content myself with saying that I think that the verdict of most scholars will be that the true order is Hosea, Deuteronomy and Jeremiah (as contemporaries the one of the other in the prophet's earliest days), the earlier form of the Law of Holiness and Ezekiel, the Priestly Code. § The only way in which Hölscher can evade the argument for the priority of Deuteronomy to Ezekiel is by cutting down the genuine prophecies of

* *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. lxiii., and for specimen parallels and diversities see pp. xciii.–iv.

† "The Date of Deuteronomy," *J.T.S.*, July, 1906, pp. 481–6.

‡ *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 31–34, and cp. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. lxiii.

§ See Dr. Skinner's *Prophecy and Religion*, chap. 6, "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy."

Ezekiel to a minimum and assigning the mass of our Book to later pseudonymous writers.*

Prof. Kennett justifies the process by which he has reconstructed history by the analogy of the work of " the anatomist, who from a few scattered bones reconstructs a whole skeleton." We must however remember that, in order to bring about this reconstruction, he has had to pull to pieces a previous construction of the history by one who may have been living at the time and whom Dr. Skinner characterizes as " an honest, fair-minded and reliable historian." Kennett quotes 2 Kings 23^{23-25} as shewing that the writer must have been writing after the Fall of Jerusalem, but Skinner gives good reasons for thinking that this particular passage is due to a later Editor and that the principal writer wrote before that event.† By Kennett's magic wand " what was once considered a barren period of history in a wasted land " ‡ is made to " rejoice and blossom as the rose," but one has an uneasy feeling that it may be the magic of the conjuror rather than the vision of the sober historian, and that the Deuteronomic rose has been transplanted from an earlier period, when the Temple at Jerusalem was still in being.

IV. Prof. Welch, as we have seen, is not satisfied with any of the above hypotheses and he propounds another.

1. We have all been wrong, he says, in thinking that the Deuteronomic code demands centralisation. From the days of the Exile everyone has understood " the place which Yahweh thy God shall choose " as meaning one central sanctuary, but this was a mistake. The phrase really meant any local sanctuary which was a genuine shrine for the worship of Yahweh alone and had never had

* " Hesekiel der Dichter und das Buch," *Z.A.W.*, Beiheft 39. See account of Hölscher's article in Box's article in *Ch. Quart. Rev.*, July, 1925.

† *The Century Bible, 1 and 2 Kings*, pp. 18–23.

‡ *J.T.S.*, July, 1906, p. 500.

associations with Canaanite worship. Once grant this interpretation and the legislation becomes intelligible as the product of the religious revival under the earlier prophets from Samuel onwards.*

i. We cordially grant that Welch has admirably brought out the fact that much of the legislation reflects primitive and simple social and political conditions.† At the same time we need to bear in mind Dr. S. A. Cook's caveat that these simple conditions are not necessarily criteria of antiquity and may have reproduced themselves in Palestine in exilic and post-exilic times.‡

ii. We agree also with his proposition that, apart from the particular phrase in dispute, the main concern of many of the laws is " the distinctive, divinely authorised character of Israel's worship " and that this must be offered at Yahweh's altar in accordance with the rites which Yahweh has laid down. A very large proportion of Welch's book is devoted to the elucidation of these two points, and in this respect could not be bettered.

2. But from this point we must part company.

---

* *Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 30–31, 197, etc.

† See, e.g., *Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 25–29 on the law of the First-fruits in 26[1-11]. In the EXPOSITOR article, pp. 353–5, Welch refers to this as " an archaic ritual about the harvest-thanksgiving which the legislators did not themselves follow." He says that it was " already so old and primitive as to have passed out of use in the period of Josiah. No one has ever suggested that the feast of harvest-thanksgiving, which was carried out under Josiah and which was so prominent a feature of the reform, followed the simple rubric, which is laid down in 26[1-7]." It would be interesting to hear from Welch where we can read about this feast of harvest-thanksgiving in Josiah's reign. Was he thinking of Neh. 8[13-17] ? And how does he know that the ritual of Deut. 26[1-7] had " already passed out of use " by 621 B.C. ? This is only one of several curious slips, e.g., the citation (on p. 114 of *The Code of Deuteronomy*) of Amos 9[7] as saying that Yahweh brought the *Canaanites* from Kir.

‡ S. A. Cook, "Some Tendencies in Old Testament Criticism," *J.T.S.*, Jan., 1925, pp. 156–173. Cp. Welch's own note (p. 154 of his book) on the conjunction of elders and judges in Deut. 21[2] and Ezra 10[14], in which he says : " Was there a revival of primitive custom after the Exile . . . ? " Note also his own explanation on p. 188 of the absence of technical terms which he comments on in an earlier passage (p. 163).

i. We cannot accept Welch's view of the crucial phrase, describing the legitimate place of worship, which in one form or other occurs 21 times in Deut. 12–31.* This has for over two thousand years been regarded as clearly laying down the sole legitimacy of the central sanctuary. But, says Dr. Welch, "from the purely linguistic point of view the phrase is tolerant of the other interpretation, according to which the Israelites are commanded to confine their worship to sanctuaries which belong to their own faith." and, when so read, the command "loses at once all appearance of an impracticable dream." I must confess to grave doubts as to the legitimacy of construing the above-mentioned phrase, even in its simplest form, as meaning ' a place which Yahweh shall choose which is near your home, or which is within the borders of your own tribe.' No doubt in Hebrew the definite article is sometimes used where we should use the indefinite. I give some instances in a footnote,† but it will be noted that in all these cases the noun is not otherwise defined, whereas in the phrase " the place which the LORD (thy God) shall choose . . . " the noun is defined by the following relative clause. Welch ‡ agrees with König against Oestreicher that the definite article, prefixed to ' place,' cannot by itself be regarded as distributive and taken as meaning ' any place,' but he seems to think that the further definition afforded by the relative

---

* 12$^{5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26}$, 14$^{23, 24, 25}$, 15^{20}, 16$^{2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16}$, 17$^{8, 10}$, 18^{6}, 26^{2}, 31^{11}. Cp. Josh. 9^{27}, 1 Kings 9^{3}, 11^{36}, 2 Kings 21$^{4, 7}$.

† " It is a peculiarity of Hebrew thought to conceive an object as defined by its being taken for a particular purpose and . . . to prefix the article to the noun denoting it " : e.g., 1 Sam. 10^{1}, Heb. *the* cruse of oil, 10^{25} *the* book (see R.V.m.), etc. " Nouns which are not definite in themselves acquire definiteness from the context or from the manner in which they are introduced " : e.g., Josh. 8^{11} and Sam. 17^{3} *the* valley. The article is also used " with nouns that denote objects or classes of objects that are known to all " : e.g., Deut. 8^{3} *the* bread, and, " prefixed to generic nouns (in the sing.), it designates the class, i.e. it imparts to the noun a collective force " : e.g., Nu. 21^{7} Heb. *the serpent*, E.V. the serpents. (See the *Oxford Lexicon,* pp. 207–8.)

‡ *Expository Times,* July, 1925.

clause following gives to the phrase the force of 'such a sanctuary as Yahweh has chosen.' This seems to me more than doubtful. I can find no adequate parallel case in which a noun with the article, followed by a defining relative clause of this type, can be treated as standing for one of a class.*

The words added to the phrase in 12^{14} " in one of thy tribes " increase the difficulty of such an interpretation. Welch says that this means " in any one of thy tribes " and compares it with 19^5 " the manslayer shall flee unto one of these cities and live," and $23^{17\ (E.V.16)}$ " a servant which is escaped . . . shall dwell . . . in the place he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best." †
But this does not help him. It is true that the manslayer and the refugee slave had a choice of cities or gates in which he might dwell, but he could only choose one of them and in that one he had to abide. In like manner Yahweh had a choice of any one of twelve tribes in which His place of worship might be located, but, having chosen "the place in one of " them, that one place was His only legitimate sanctuary.‡   Welch (*Expository Times*, July, 1925) answers that a human being can only choose one place to dwell in, but that Yahweh can choose, and dwell at, any number. He quotes in this connection Ex. 20^{24}, but the phrases are not equivalent. Ex. 20^1 plainly says : " in every place where I record my name," Deut. 12 does not (see König ‡). Welch has a second

* Cp. Gen. 22^3 " the place of which God had told him "; Deut. 1^8, etc. " the land which Yahweh sware unto your fathers to give unto them " ; 8^3 " the way which Yahweh thy God hath led thee." Note Deut. 26^{1-3} " the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee . . . the place which the LORD thy God shall choose to cause His name to dwell there . . . the land which the LORD sware unto our fathers to give us." How can we take the phrases about the land as signifying one land and take the exactly similar phrase in the same context as referring to a multiplicity of places ? The writer of 31^{9-13} clearly means that ' all Israel ' is to assemble at the central sanctuary and the law is to be taken out of the ark and read in their hearing.

† *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 48–9.

‡ I see that König (*Z.A.W.*, 1925) and Sellin (in his *History*) take the same line.

answer (in reply to Gressmann on 16^{5-6}), viz. that the Passover law was addressed to ' the people of Ephraim ' only. The writer '' did not need to use the plural, for to those for whom it was meant there was only one Yahweh sanctuary, viz. their tribal shrine. It is a local law.'' This seems to be an acknowledgment that if the law was intended for more than one tribe, the plural would be needed. And does Welch contend that the whole Code was for one tribe only ? If not, how does he know that ' the passover law ' was for Ephraim only ? This argument does not square with that which he has hitherto elaborated. Finally when Welch comes in his argument to 12^5, '' the place which Yahweh your God shall choose *out of all your tribes* to set his name there,'' he recognises that the section in which it occurs '' definitely and uncompromisingly orders the central-isation of the cult.'' Every kind of offering is to be brought to the one central place. How then does he deal with it ? He ' cuts the Gordian knot ' by repudiating it as a late addition to the Code proper. The legitimacy of this we must now consider.

ii. It has long been recognised that 12^{1-28} is not a Unity. Carpenter and Harford state this explicitly * : '' the question,'' they say, '' has been asked by a long succession of critics . . . whether this law is throughout from the same hand. In outward form it falls at once into two sections $^{2-12}$ and $^{13-28}$, marked respectively by the prevailing use of the plural and the singular address. . . . But further each section contains its own repetitions.'' Accordingly these editors, like Welch twenty-four years later, divide the passage into 4 sections, $^{13-19}$ and $^{20-27}$ being recognised as earlier and $^{2-7}$ and $^{8-12}$ as later. So far Welch merely follows his predecessors. Where he differs from them is as to the date of 12^{1-7}. Whereas earlier scholars have regarded 12^{1-7} as an integral part of '' the book of

* *Oxford Hexateuch*, vol. ii, pp. 268–9 on 12^2, and vol. i, p. 278.

the law " which, according to 2 Kings 22, brought about the reformation under Josiah, Welch cuts it out as a late " addition to the original Code, inserted with the intention of laying down a general caveat as to the principle in the light of which all the rest must be read." *   He nowhere definitely says when this addition was made, but he seems to hold that it was made from one to two hundred years after Josiah with the object of bringing the Deuteronomic Code into line with the later Priestly legislation.   Thus, although he professes to disagree with Hölscher, he really agrees with him that the Code, as we now have it, is exilic or post-exilic, and does demand impracticabilities (p. 197). The main ground given for regarding this section as so late is " a radically different historical view of the conquest, as seen in " the last revision of the book of Joshua " (pp. 57–8).   This appears to be a reference to such passages as Joshua 10^{28-43}, $11^{2-3,\ 10-23}$, 12^{1-24}, 23, but these are due to a Deuteronomic writer, whereas " the last revision " was made by a Priestly writer (the greater part of chapters 15–22).   On the same grounds he must cut out Deut. 7^{2-5}, 19^1, 20^{16-18} (and, in Exodus, 34^{12-16}), for they speak of extermination and destruction in the very same way.   The other grounds adduced seem to me to be equally inconclusive, but space forbids comment upon them.   The curious thing is that in the same book (pp. 205–6) Welch says that Deuteronomy was too different from the Priestly ideals to be adapted by revision ; it was therefore left as it stood, and new laws made for new conditions.   But, if 12^{1-7} was added, definitely insisting on an " impracticable " central-isation, was it left as it stood ?

iii. By making 12^{1-7} post-Josianic, Welch comes face to face with the statement in 2 Kings 22–23.†   As we saw in

* *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 194–7 and 57–61.

† In a footnote on p. 73 he acknowledges this, " but," he says, " the

section II (above), these chapters unmistakably assert that the reformation of Josiah was carried through on the lines of Deuteronomy and especially of 12^{1-7}. These seven verses demand just the kind of action which the king took. If they were not in ' the book of the covenant ' and if, as Welch says, the rest of the book does not demand centralization or make the same sweeping attack upon idolatrous sanctuaries and altars, it is impossible to see how that book came to produce so tremendous a revolution. It seems to me that, although he nowhere explicitly says so, Welch is compelled by the exigencies of his theory to range himself with Kennett and to throw overboard the trustworthiness of the account in Kings. Yet on his very last page he writes : " in the Josianic reform it was decreed that one form of cult at one holy place through one official priesthood was alone legitimate." If king and high-priest and entourage regarded it as practicable to act as they did, why should 12^{1-7} be rejected on the ground that centralization was impracticable ? There is a cryptic remark at the end of the section on Deuteronomy in the EXPOSITOR article as to " the need to define more clearly than has yet been done what was the new element which came into the life of Israel at the time of Josiah." Deuteronomy, as he truly says, when emasculated by the cutting out of 12^{1-7} and interpreted on his lines, does not supply anything revolutionary. " The new factor must be in the conclusion drawn from . . . the older body of law. Precisely what this was demands definition." Certainly, if we accept Welch's theory, it does demand it. And I think Welch ought to have given it. Until he does, it would seem much simpler to say that Josiah's book of the covenant did contain 12^{1-7} and that this book, backed by the resolute

critical examination of the account of Josiah's reform cannot find room here." I think that, in the interests of his argument, he should have at least indicated the solution at which he has arrived.

effort of the body of reformers, is a sufficient explanation of the action taken by the king.

3. Let us take two passages of Deuteronomy and see how the theory works out.

i. As an illustration of the way in which Welch has treated the account in 2 Kings, let us take his comparison between the Deuteronomic Code and 2 Kings in the matter of the Passover.* He tells us that, if we understand " the place which Yahweh shall choose " ($16^{2,\ 7}$) as he proposes, the Passover law becomes practicable. It puts into the foreground " three things : (1) Pesach (i.e. Passover) is to fall in Abib and so be linked with the historic past ; (2) it is to be celebrated at a purely Yahweh sanctuary ; (3) it is to be celebrated in haste, one night only to be spent at the sanctuary and none of the flesh to remain until the morning. He goes on : " These things are ignored in the account of Josiah's passover and what is emphasized as present at Josiah's passover is absent from Deuteronomy." This is an extraordinarily misleading statement. (a) One would imagine from its wording that there was a full account of Josiah's passover in 2 Kings. But, as soon as the passage is turned to, it is seen that there is no account at all in Kings of how the passover was kept. 23^{21-23} merely states that (1) " the king commanded all the people, saying, Keep the passover unto Yahweh your God, as it is written in this book of the Covenant " ; (2) no such passover had hitherto been kept ; " but (3) in the eighteenth year of King Josiah was this passover kept to Yahweh at Jerusalem." That is all ! †   (b) What does Welch mean by saying :

* Deut. 16^{1-7}, 2 Kings 23^{21-23}. *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 62–78, especially 74.

† The account of the passover in 2 Chron. 35 is so obviously expressed in the language and according to the ideals of the post-exilic writer that it cannot be appealed to as a witness to what actually historically took place.

"these things are ignored," when with one exception no details at all are given ? For the way in which the feast was kept the writer refers his readers to "this book of the Covenant." If the Code of Deuteronomy was the whole, or a part, of "this book," we may infer that (1) and (3) were observed ; and, as regards (2) we *are* told that it was kept unto Yahweh in Jerusalem." Was not this a celebration at a purely Yahweh sanctuary ? It may not be Welch's understanding of "the place which Yahweh shall choose," but it seems to have been the way in which King Josiah understood it and we cannot be surprised that he did so understand it. (c) What again is meant by "what is emphasized at present at Josiah's passover is absent from Deuteronomy " ? If the words "in Jerusalem " (2 Kings 23[23]) are referred to, it is true that these actual words are "absent from Deuteronomy," but (1) they could not be put into the mouth of Moses ; (2) in Deuteronomy, as it stands, the *thing* is there—in 12[5-7], by Welch's own admission * and in 16[2-7] twice, according to the natural meaning of the words in Josiah's day—and to say that it is not there is to beg the question which is under discussion ; (3) no special emphasis is laid upon the words "in Jerusalem." In fact the statement is as unemphatic as possible. Verse [22] says : "Surely there was not kept such a passover from the days of the judges . . ." but it does not state that its novel character consisted solely in the particular that it was kept at Jerusalem.

One word more. Welch says † : "Passover had never before been celebrated at the central sanctuary, and it was never so celebrated again." How does he know ? Does he rule out Ezra 6[19-22] as unhistorical ? Do not 2 Chron. 30 and 35 point to a contemporary usage familiar to the Chronicler on which he based his account of the earlier

* *The Code of Deuteronomy*, p. 58.   † On page 71.

celebrations under Hezekiah and Josiah ? Later Judaism certainly kept it at Jerusalem (see Talmud [Pesachim], Josephus, Bk. of Jubilees, N.T.).

ii. Kennett and Welch both draw attention to the remarkable passage, Deut. 27$^{1-8}$. * According to Kennett, the instruction to set up the stones and to build the altar on Mount Ebal " can only mean that at least on one occasion, in spite of the centralisation of worship at Jerusalem, sacrifice was allowed at Shechem. . . . The venerable stones of Shechem were . . . made to witness to the new law [i.e. Deuteronomy] and on the altar of Shechem a solemn sacrifice was offered, perhaps for the last time, by which the Shechemite population entered into a compact to keep the law with the rest of Israel." This is a fine effort of the imagination, but I think few will agree that the injunction " can only mean " that after the Exile and after centralisation a sacrifice was allowed on one occasion at Shechem. Welch also gives somewhat free rein to his imagination. After pointing out various perplexing features of the passage, he appeals to the one unambiguous point. " The author of this section did not believe in centralisation." " He represents Moses as commanding Joshua † to erect an altar on Mount Ebal, to sacrifice on it, and to celebrate a Yahweh festival." This is next expanded into " Moses commanded his successor to institute a local sanctuary." " He [i.e. Moses] carefully provides for the religious needs of his people. They are equipped from the beginning with their own place of worship. Further, the men who wrote this account evidently regarded the sanctuary at Ebal as being the first which was erected in Palestine." Thus

* Kennett, *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, pp. 24–25 ; "The Date of Deuteronomy" (*J.T.S.*, July, 1906, pp. 493–8) ; Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 178–185.

† So Welch three times (pp. 179, 181, 184), but the context clearly shows that ' thou ' is the nation, not an individual.

" we are carried to Northern Israel and to one of its leading sanctuaries." Yet, if anyone reads the passage in Deuteronomy carefully, he cannot but see that nothing is said about forming a permanent sanctuary for Israel. And he will search the Old Testament in vain to find even a hint that sacrifice was ever offered again on Mount Ebal. The ' great stones ' remind Hölscher of Josh. 4$^{4\mathrm{ff}}$; the altar is connected by Sellin with Josh. 8$^{30\mathrm{ff}}$; Kennett regards Deut. 27$^{2-8}$ as probably combining two laws, referring respectively to Gilgal and Ebal. But, whatever be the exact relationship of Josh. 8$^{30\mathrm{ff}}$ to the passage in Deuteronomy, it is clear that the writer represents Joshua and all Israel as carrying out the command once for all soon after their entrance into the land and that he has no idea that Israel was thus " equipped with their own place of worship." Welch no doubt, like Kennett, is thinking of Shechem, but in the first place mountain and valley are not the same thing, and in the second place, if Shechem was one of the leading northern sanctuaries, it is curious that never again after Josh. 24^{26} is Shechem mentioned as a sanctuary of Yahweh at all.*

Conclusion.

Is it possible from these conflicting arguments to construct a theory which will cover all the facts ? May we not say that

1. In Deuteronomy we have a compilation of laws and groups of laws, probably laid down at different times, at different centres and by different authorities. Welch happily compares most of them to " the decisions of an ecclesiastical synod in the mediæval period " (p. 189). The laws about firstfruits, tithes and sacrifices may have

* In Judges 9$^{4, 46}$, cf. 8^{33} we read of a house of Baal-berith or El-berith at Shechem. Shechem was an important political centre in the days of Rehoboam and Jeroboam, but lost its significance when first Tirah and then Samaria become the northern capital.

originally required only that they should be offered at a local sanctuary.

2. But, if so, experience proved the difficulty of controlling the ritual and customs of these local shrines. A certain school, composed both of priests and prophets, deemed therefore that purity of worship could only be obtained by centralisation. They took the original laws, breathed into them their own ideal, expressed in their own phraseology, altered the phrase which pointed to the local Yahweh sanctuaries into their own characteristic phrase (shaped in various forms) and prefixed a new section, definitely ordering centralisation. Chapters 1–11 may also have been added partly then and partly later. This would account, at once, for those more primitive features to which Welch points, for the actual reformation in the days of Josiah, and for the understanding of the whole book as demanding centralisation, which obtained universally at least from the Exile onwards. Similar views as to the process by which Leviticus 17^{1-9} took its present form are expressed by Driver,* Kittel, Dillmann and others.

We may readily grant to Hölscher and Welch that the men who introduced the ideal of the one central sanctuary may not have fully thought out all its implications, if rigidly enforced. But there was no question of imposing them by force. The appeal is rather to the voluntary obedience of the community.† We may well believe that the Deuteronomic reformers were reasonable men, that they would not demand impossibilities and that distance,

---

* *Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. 138. " The most probable opinion is that, as originally formulated (as part of the ' Law of Holiness '), Lev. 17^{1-9} had no reference to a central sanctuary, but presupposed a *plurality* of legitimate sanctuaries, and was only accommodated to the single sanctuary by a modification of its phraseology, when it was incorporated in P," etc.

† See *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 186–7.

infirmities, the hostility of neighbours, etc., etc., would be recognised as conditioning actual observance. We owe a great debt of gratitude to Kennett, Hölscher and Welch for their fresh treatment of the problem of Deuteronomy, but, in spite of all that they have said, we shall, it seems to me, do well to trust in the main the account given to us in 2 Kings 22 and 23 and to believe that " the book of the Covenant," which is said to have led to the reformation under Josiah, was at least the main part of the present Book of Deuteronomy.

SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

SYNOPSIS OF ARTICLE.

C. The nature and date of the Priestly Code.
   The third main position of the regnant hypothesis.
   Has it ' suffered severely ' at the hands of recent critics ?
  I. What is ' the Priestly Code ' ?   Its *primâ facie* meaning.
 II. The modern view.   Two illustrations, ' tent ' and ' ark.'
III. In defence of Mosaic authorship.   Orr, Wiener.   The problem
      of the priests and Levites.
 IV. Criticism of the modern view on three lines.   Welch.
        1. Is the theory based on a sound historical foundation ?
           i. A preliminary caveat.
          ii. Charge of ' ignoring history.'
         iii. Prof. Torrey and Prof. Batten.
          iv. Conclusion.
        2. Did P ever have an independent existence ?
           i. If it did, why combined with older documents ?
          ii. Can this ' mere skeleton ' ever have stood alone ?
               (*a*) The supplementary theory.   Orr, Dahse.
               (*b*) The Fragmentary theory.   Max Löhr.
                     Criticism of these theories.   Skinner, Sellin.
         iii. Is its spirit and outlook uniformly narrow and legalistic ?
        3. Can P's legal code be regarded as post-exilic ?
           i. Is it uniform, or the result of a long development ?
          ii. When did the development take place ?
         iii. The Relation of prophecy and law.
          iv. Conclusion.

Article 5.   THE PROBLEM OF THE PRIESTLY CODE.

" THE third main position of the modern view " of the Old
Testament, wrote Prof. Welch in May 1923, is that " a
definite system of legislation called the Priestly Code was
adopted by the post-exilic community at the bidding of
its leader Ezra in an hour of religious and political enthu-
siasm.   The code, then introduced and bound upon the
community, marked the entry or, if not the entry, the
dominance of a new legalistic spirit, which in turn produced
a literature that recast the history of Israel and revised its
institutions.   Thus the Priestly Code is far more than a
handbook : it contains, e.g., a revision of the early tales

in Genesis and especially of the incidents at Sinai. This position is the Achilles' heel of the theory, and here, more than anywhere else, it has suffered heavily." * It is the purpose of this Article to examine and weigh the evidence adduced in proof of this statement.

I. In order to discuss intelligently the questions raised, we must first have a clear grasp of what is meant by the Priestly Code.

In Articles 1 and 2 (July, pp. 8–15; Aug., pp. 85–88) we saw that the dominant hypothesis had found in the first four books of the Pentateuch three documentary strata which had been woven together into one. One of these, generally referred to as P, contained a series of appearances to the patriarchs under the name of El Shaddai, used Elohim where another document would have used Yahweh, and was marked by a distinctive style and phraseology and by other characteristic differentiæ.

There is no dispute as to the existence of this stratum. " The sections ordinarily attributed to P," writes Orr, " have a vocabulary and a stylistic character of their own, which render them in the main readily distinguishable." † If we take a copy of the R.V. and mark in red ink every occurrence of the 50 words and phrases included in the list given by Driver in his *Introduction* (Ed.[6] pp. 130–135, Ed.[1] pp. 123–128), we find that certain sections of the Pentateuch are besprinkled with these characteristic words and phrases, while other sections are quite free from them.‡ When we

* EXPOSITOR, May 1923, pp. 359 and 345–346.

† *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 335, and see pp. 197, 340, etc. Compare Sellin's *Introduction*, p. 81. (" The portions of the Pentateuch which belong to the Priestly Writing stand out with peculiar distinctness from the remaining material, so that even the non-expert can recognize them without difficulty.")

‡ A much fuller list will be found in Carpenter and Harford's *Hexateuch*, Ed.[1], vol. i., pp. 208–221. N.B.—The explanatory introduction to the lists on pp. 183–184 should be carefully studied.

look at P, thus disentangled from the rest, we see that its central core is to be found in Exodus 25–31 and 35–40, the whole of Leviticus, Numbers 1–10, 13–20 in the main, 25–36 almost entirely. Its distinguishing characteristics are seen to be a detailed description of the Tabernacle and a series of ceremonial and legal regulations, dealing with the proper way of worshipping Yahweh and of securing the ceremonial purity of his people. This central core is placed in a framework of history, stretching from the Creation to the death of Moses, but for the most part the thread of the narrative is extremely thin and often serves merely to carry on the Chronology. It becomes fuller however when special interests come into play, as, e.g., in Genesis with regard to the three preludes to the Mosaic covenant connected with the names of Adam, Noah and Abraham.* Finally in Joshua, after a brief account of the Crossing of Jordan, the Passover and probably the stories of Achan and the Gibeonites (of which only fragments are left), P provides an account of the settlement of the Tribes in Palestine (13^{15}–22^{34} with slight exceptions). The legislative portion of this stratum, as Wellhausen said long ago, " preponderates over the rest of the legislation in force as well as in bulk. . . ." In the Pentateuch it " makes no reference to later times and settled life in Palestine and keeps strictly within the limits of the situation in the wilderness." It is very natural therefore that upon this great section have been based in the past " our conceptions of the Mosaic theocracy, with the Tabernacle as its centre, the high priest as its head, the priests and Levites as its organs, the legitimate cultus as its regular function." †

* For more adequate statement see Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 6–9; Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch* Ed.[1], vol. i., xiii., pp. 121 ff. and 272–279; Sellin, *Introduction*, pp. 81–82; Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, pp. lvii.–lix.; Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 126–128 and 159.

† Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 8–9.

II. It was only after long controversy and the labours of many scholars that this conception was abandoned as not strictly historical and another established in its place. Prof. Welch himself accepts this later conception as true to history. "It is well known," he says, "that the School which came to control the religious life of Judaism after the Exile was not content to insist on the centralisation of worship as an essential feature in their religion and on the Aaronic priesthood as the true Apostolic succession. They also taught that thus it had been from the beginning. What ultimately emerged in the course of historical development was regarded as having always been the rule and as possessing the authority of the first lawgiver." *   In conformity with this conception the Priestly writers rewrote both the history and the law. For examples, we may note their treatment of the Tent and the ark. (i.) JE tells us how Moses pitched ' the tent of meeting ' † afar off from the camp. There he met God, Who came down in a pillar of cloud and spake with him face to face. Everyone who sought the LORD went out to this tent. In none of these passages is anything said about priests or altar or sacrifice, but this may be due to an Editor. Joshua is the custodian of the tent in the absence of Moses. Deuteronomy has no reference to this tent at all, apart from the passage from E in chap. 31. Outside P and Chronicles ' the tent of meeting ' is only mentioned again in 1 Sa. 2^{22b} and 1 Ki. 8^4 (= 2 Chr. 5^5), both of which passage shew marks of

---

* Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy*, pp. 175–176, cp. p. 205. "Israel became a Church," etc.

† E 6 times (Ex. 33^7, Nu. 11^{16}, 12^4, Deut. 31^{14}), 13 times ' the Tent ' alone (Ex. 33^{8-11}, Nu. $11^{24, 26}$, $12^{5, 10}$, Dt. 31^{15}). Moffatt translates : ' the Trysting tent.' Welch speaks of "the early institutions of the tent of witness and the ark," but regards them as Palestinian and only in later days " derived from Moses and carried back to the period of Sinai." He uses the title ' tent of witness ' (rather ' of the testimony '), but this is not early, occurring only in P (4 times in Nu.) and once in 2 Chr. 24^6. Compare ' the Dwelling of the testimony ' in P only (Ex., Nu. 5 times).

later insertion. But when we turn to P, we find 'the tent of meeting' referred to 131 times.* P places it in the centre of the camp and the Levites camp around it in their thousands. Within the tent he places 'the Dwelling' (A.V. Tabernacle),† made of portable boards and lined with rich hangings, and therein take place the solemn sacrifices and ritual of the Priestly Law. (ii.) The ark in JE goes before the host, when on the march (Nu. 10^{33-36}, Josh. $3^{6, 11, 14}$, 4^7). According to Deuteronomy (10^{1-5}) Moses at the divine command makes an Ark before, for the second time, ascending Mt. Horeb to receive two tables of stone, and on his descent he places the tables therein. In all probability JE, which Deuteronomy habitually follows, originally contained an account of the making of the ark, this being omitted, when P's account was added. In P the ark is made at a later date (Ex. 37^{1-9}) by Bezalel ; it is kept in the Holy of holies and, when on the march, is carried by the Levites in the midst of the host, six tribes preceding and six following it.

There are but two examples of the numerous phenomena, which are found, when P is compared with JE and D. In the light of these the modern view, which regards P as a rewriting of early history and law in accordance with the usage and ideas of the post-exilic age, has won very general acceptance from scholars in every land, but it has in its turn met with vigorous criticism from the right and the left wings.

III. There are those who still maintain, in some shape or form, the Mosaic authorship.‡ Within the limits of a

---

* Including Josh. 18^1, 19^{51}.

† P 101 times. Chron. 8 times—only again (in sing.) literally in 2 Sa. $7^6 = 1$ Chr. 17^5 (probably a gloss) ; never in J, E or D. (It is used *metaphorically* of Temple or House of God, Ezek. 37^{27}, Pss. 26^8, 74^7 and in plural 43^3, 46^4, etc.)

‡ Orr, *Problem of the Old Testament*, pp. 285–377 ; Wiener, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, Pentateuchal Studies*, etc., etc.

single article it is only possible to give one sample of the arguments by which they seek to make good their position. Wellhausen spoke of "the position of the Levites" as "the Achilles heel of the Priestly Code." * If, i.e., the modern theory is here proved to be wrong, then its days are numbered. First then let us see what are the Biblical data, then let us compare the solutions.

1. The Biblical data are these. (i) In P (Ex.–Nu.) we find two orders of Ministrants, sharply divided the one from the other. Aaron and his sons (Lev. 8–10, Nu. 3^{1-4}) are consecrated to be priests, performing all ritual and service within the Sanctuary and blessing the people ; they alone may touch the holy things. The tribe of Levi are then (Nu. 3^{5}–4, 18^{1-7}) given to Aaron. There are 22,000 † males of a month old and upward, of whom 8,580 are between 30 and 50 years of age. These latter carry the Dwelling and its holy contents when on journeys and camp round the sacred Tent when it is at rest. The holy things must be covered up by the priests, before the Levites come in to carry them, lest they die. The Levites are given the tithe (Nu. 18^{21-24}) and forty-eight cities (Nu. 35^{1-8}, a command given 'in the plains of Moab'). (ii) In Deuteronomy all is changed. There is one order only, ' the Levitical priests ' ($17^{9, 18,}$ etc.) ; ‡ gulf between priests and Levites there is none. " Deuteronomy knows no Levites who cannot be priests and no priests who are not Levites." § 'Moses' in 10^{8} says : " at that time [either at Jotbathah after the death of Aaron, or more

---

* *Prolegomena*, p. 167.

† Wiener, not unnaturally from his point of view, regards this number as ' corrupt.'

‡ ' the Priests the Levites ' $17^{9, 18}$, 18^{1}, 24^{8}, 27^{9}, Josh. 3^{3r}, 8^{33} ; ' the sons of Levi ' 21^{5}, 31^{9} ; ' the priest(s) ' 17^{12}, 18^{3}, 19^{17}, 20^{2}, 26^{3}, Josh. $4^{3r,9}$; ' the tribe of Levi ' 10^{8}, 18^{1} ; Josh. 13^{14} ; ' the Levite that is within your gates ' $12^{12, 18}$, 14^{27}, $16^{11, 14}$, cp. 26^{11} ; ' the Levite ' 12^{19}, 14^{29}, 18^{6} (Heb.), $26^{12, 13}$; ' the Levites ' 27^{14}, 31^{25} (r=redactor).

§ W. Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, Ed. ², p. 360.

probably at Horeb, [6-7] being a later insertion] Yahweh separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, to stand before Yahweh to minister unto Him and to bless in His name unto this day " (cp. 21[5] with its additional words). These are priestly functions. There is no hint that this is revolutionary. On the contrary it has been so from the beginning of their ministry ' unto this day.' The Levite now " has no inheritance " (19[9], etc.), but, like the stranger and the widow, dwells on other people's land and is an object for charitable consideration (12[12], etc.). (iii) The historical and prophetical books in their genuine writings know nothing of the distinction between priest and Levite. The apparent exceptions in Joshua all occur in the long section (13[15]–22[34]) which is almost entirely from the hand of P. In Judges 17–20 we read stories of two wandering Levites, one of whom is said to be a grandson of Moses and is consecrated by Micah (!) to be his priest in his private shrine. In Samuel and Kings there are only three references to Levites (1 Sam. 6[15], 2 Sam. 15[24], 1 Kings 8[4]) and all three for one reason or another are suspect. Isa. 66[21], Jer. 33[18-22], Mal. 2[4,8,] 3[3], Ps. 135[20] (Zech. 12[13]) are the only references in psalm or prophecy (Ezekiel excepted) to Levites or to the house or tribe of Levi. They breathe the same atmosphere as Deuteronomy. (iv) Ezekiel has 8 references to ' the Levites ' in 40–48. Here we again come upon a clear division of ' the sons of Levi ' (40[46]) into two Orders, but upon totally different grounds ; the Zadokite Levites of Jerusalem are alone to be priests in the renovated Temple, the country Levites are to be degraded because of their idolatry ; they are no longer to be priests, but are to perform the lesser duties which have for too long been performed in Jerusalem by uncircumcized temple-slaves (44[6-16]). (v) Finally, in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah we find the two Orders actually ministering in the second

Temple side by side. The Levites are mentioned 161 times and the priests 175 times. This is evidently regarded as the normal and only legal state of things.

How are these phenomena to be explained ?

Orr * acknowledges frankly that, when one passes from Numbers to Deuteronomy, " the difference in point of view and mode of speech must be apparent to every reader ; and," he goes on to say, " it may at once be conceded . . . that if we had only Deuteronomy, we should never be able to arrive at a knowledge of the sharp division of the tribe of Levi into the superior and subordinate Orders with which the Levitical law makes us acquainted." Writing on Deuteronomy, he does his best to get round the differences in phraseology and in the whole conception of the Levites' duties and status, and to shew that in spite of all appearance to the contrary the two orders still existed as they are depicted in Numbers, but his arguments remind one of the proverbial drowning man catching at straws.

Wiener † also desires to maintain the Mosaic authorship, but he rejects Orr's position as impossible, and proposes another. P, he says, is legislation for the wilderness. As soon as the wanderings are over, the tribe of Levi will no longer be needed to carry the Dwelling and its holy things, and on the other hand some of the priestly duties will require a numerous body of priests, scattered over the land. The one family of Aaron could not possibly perform them. Moses therefore, on the plains of Moab, reverses the whole scheme and the whole tribe of Levi are advanced to priestly status. From Moses to Malachi every writer who touches on the subject recognizes this Levitical priesthood. Moreover the Order of Aaron dies out with Abiathar, and Zadok

* *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 185 and the whole section, pp. 184–192.

† *Pentateuchal Studies*, pp. 231–286.

by royal order takes his place. During the Exile Ezekiel puts forward a plan for ' once more ' dividing the Levitical priesthood into two classes. We find this division in full operation in the days of Nehemiah. Finally in Chronicles (' midrash ' and not literal history) we find the religious life of the nation rewritten on the lines of P, as read in the light of the actual institutions of (say) 300 B.C.

The recognition by Wiener that the priesthood in Palestine was always Levitical from the crossing of Jordan until after Ezekiel is welcome, but when he asserts that the scheme of two Orders, as seen in Numbers, was only in force in the wilderness and that Moses silently cancelled it and substituted another on reaching the plains of Moab, he has to resort to desperate arguments to justify himself. ' True,' he says in effect, the Orders of Aaronic priests and of Levites were established as ' a Statute for ever ' (Ex. 29^9 and Nu. 18^{23}), but the phrase only means ' permanent for the time being ' and the statute could be altered by lawgiver, prophet or even king at a moment's notice.* ' True,' no hint is given in Deuteronomy that so revolutionary a change is being effected and Moses (10^8) speaks as if the Levites had exercised priestly powers from the beginning but probably " something has fallen out from Exodus," † " or Numbers."

The solution accepted by the large majority of modern scholars avoids these difficulties. It sees in the earliest

---

* *Pentateuchal Studies*, p. 243 ; *Early Hebrew History*, pp. 57 ff. Wiener quotes Ex. 12^{21-24} (a statute only observable at home), 23^{17} (' a few weeks later, necessitating absence from home '), Nu. 19^{6-14} (note [7] ' offer an oblation '), and Dt. 16^{1-7} as offering " a brilliant illustration of the meaning of ' for ever ' in legislation of this character and of the operation of the law of change . . . in the circumstances." It seems to me a brilliant illustration of how a clever man can circumvent the meaning of a phrase which doesn't fit in with his pet theory. ' A statute for ever ' is only used in P (33 times in MT).

† *Studies*, p. 252, cp. pp. 243, 257.

sources primitive forms of worship and of priesthood, which prevailed for a long time. It was good to have a Levite for one's priest, but it was not essential (Judg. $17^{13, 5}$). In the days of Josiah the growing conviction of the necessity of reform leads to action. The position of ' the priests the Levites ' is strengthened and the worship centralized. Ezekiel, in his scheme for the renovated Temple, seeks reformation by confining the priesthood to the sons of Zadok and reducing the country Levites to an inferior position. We know that this was in full operation in the days of Nehemiah. Somewhere about 500 B.C. (?) a priestly writer (or school of writers), desiring to give fullest authority to this order of things, re-edits and rewrites Law and History. In all good faith and in accordance with oriental habit, he sets forth in the name of Moses the conception of the Orders of ministry which obtained in his own day. He bridges the gulf of centuries by asserting the perpetual obligation of these professedly Mosaic regulations as being ' statutes for ever throughout your generations.' Instead of presenting us with the puzzling problem of two periods, during which there ministered two sharply contrasted Orders of priests and Levites, separated by a gulf of many centuries during which this arrangement was ignored by everyone, this critical solution shews us good reasons for concluding that P's picture of the Mosaic theocracy is a reflection back into the distant past of the twofold, not to say threefold, ministry as it existed in the writer's own day. It relieves the religious leaders of the nation, in the past, from the charge of wilful neglect of the Mosaic ordinances, and presents P not as the foundation but as ' the headstone ' of the Pentateuch.*

* This is only ' a sample,' and it suffers from the inevitable limitations of a sample. Students should (1) read the fuller argument in Wellhausen, *Prolegomena,* pp. 121–151 ; Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.,* pp. 358–362 ;

IV. We must now turn to those criticisms of the modern view which, in Welch's opinion, have really effected damaging blows. As presented by him, they raise three points, relating respectively to (1) P's historical basis, (2) its narrative, and (3) its code of laws.

1. Is the theory based on a sound historical foundation ? " Did the post-exilic community ever gather together and, after having read a detailed series of law, solemnly pledge themselves to observe this law as the basis of their new life in Jerusalem ? Is it even conceivable that such a thing was ever done ?

i. This point, Welch says, is 'fundamental.' Is it ? The same initial criticism which we raised to Welch's statement of the problem of Deuteronomy applies to this also. The exact historical circumstances in which P came into force is not a fundamental issue. Even if the historicity of the description (Neh. 8) of the public reading of " the book of the law of Moses " and of the Covenant to keep it were successfully impugned, it would not affect the really fundamental position. This position is that P is later than Deuteronomy and is exilic or post-exilic, and this is based, not upon the historicity of Ezra, but upon quite other grounds, such as " the more advanced stage of ritual organization and hierarchical order " in comparison both with JE and D, its kinship with Ezekiel on the one hand and with Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah on the other, and its theological conceptions. *

ii. Yet, while that is so, still it has been generally held, both by conservative and by liberal scholars, that the public reading of the law described in Nehemiah 8 was a real bit

Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch*, vol. i., pp. 53, 76–77, 127–128 ; Driver, *Commentary on Deut.*, pp. 218–221, and (2) note that this is only one item in a closely related whole, which needs to be studied as a whole, if its cumulative force is to be adequately realized.

* See, e.g., Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 136–142.

of history. Welch, however, is very doubtful on the subject. " Ezra and Nehemiah," he says, " are the conclusion of the Book of Chronicles," and every statement in that book has been regarded by the critics as historically suspect. Yet this particular story they " accepted without question." They " built their theory on a basis which had not been tested," and " the further use of the historical principles, which produced the theory, has undermined its foundations. Torrey * believes himself justified in pronouncing that Ezra is not an historical person at all, but a creation of the Chronicler's imagination. And, while this conclusion may seem, and does seem to many, an extreme case of historical scepticism, the mere fact that it could be advanced by a serious student of history with a reputation to lose has underlined the fact that in this case historical criticism has ignored history." The charge here made of building on an untested foundation seems to me quite gratuitous.† The men who tested the statements of the Chronicler in the earlier part of his work were not the men to ' accept without question ' his statement in the concluding section. It was a reasonable judgment which regarded the Chronicler's account of what happened after the Exile and possibly within a hundred years of the date of his writing,‡ as much more likely to be near to the historical facts than when he was writing of times centuries earlier and separated from him by the cataclysm of the Captivity. As for the inference drawn from " the mere fact " of Torrey's sceptical views about Ezra, would Welch regard it as legitimate

* C. C. Torrey, Professor at Yale, " Composition and Historical Value of Ezra–Nehemiah," *Z.A.W.*,[Beiheft 2 (1896) ; *Ezra Studies*, University Press, Chicago (1910).

† Compare the similar charge as to the use of the MT, dealt with in Art. 2 (p. 43).

‡ Prof. Batten gives reasons for thinking that Ezra's date may have been 397 B.C. *I.C. Commentary on Ezra*, pp. 28–30.

argument to accuse the scholars, who have accepted as historical the main facts of the story of Christ, of having " ignored history " (whatever that may mean), because of ' the mere fact ' that certain scholars in Holland and America have put forward similar sceptical views as to the historicity of our Lord ?

iii. Torrey's arguments involve an entire rewriting of the history of the Jews during the Exile and after.   The exiles of 597 and 586 B.C. were, he says, less than 5,000 (Jer. 52$^{28-30}$, but this is late and not in 2 Ki. 25).   They settled down permanently in their new homes and, in any large numbers, never returned.   They were not interested in a ritual law which could only take effect in Palestine.   P was the product of many priests and of a long period, and all in Judæa.   The whole of the Old Testament was written in Palestine, none in Babylonia.   The exiles of whom the prophets are constantly speaking were the emigrants, who were continually streaming away from the unfertile land of their fathers and were forming colonies in Egypt and else- where.   The Babylonian exiles were but a small part of ' the Dispersion ' and are seldom mentioned separately except by pseudo-Jeremiah and the Chronicler.   As for Ezra he is so precisely like the Chronicler himself in all his interests and principles, and his story is so clearly written in the phraseology of that writer, that we can only conclude that the latter is in fact his literary creator.*

All this is ably argued, but, as Prof. Batten † says, " Torrey's arguments have failed to convince those who have been diligent students of the story of Ezra."   The reasons are sound which justify belief in the historical character of the man Ezra and in the existence of a personal

* *Ezra Studies,* pp. 238–248, 263, 285–297, etc.
† Prof. of the General Theological Seminary, New York, *I.C. Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah,* pp. 16–18, 51–52.

memoir by him, underlying 7^{27t}, 8^{15-34}, 9^{1-15}. No doubt Ezra's memoir " has been worked over a great deal and the numerous marks of the Chronicler are due to his revision," but plainly the Chronicler in these passages is using a source and " the passages in the first person are precisely those which raise no suspicion on the ground of credibility."

iv. But even if Ezra were not an historical personage, the fundamental position of the regnant hypothesis would remain unshaken. On this point I cannot do better than quote Welch himself : " it may be justly urged that what the Chronicler has done has been to concentrate into one dramatic act and to represent as the work of one man what was the work of a period and due to the activity of several actors. The fact may still remain that the Priest Code is the creation of the post-exilic community, when it reconstituted itself at Jerusalem. To ascribe the act to Ezra is merely to recognise that then the leadership did fall to the priesthood, and that the new code bears their impress in the subjects in which it is chiefly interested and in the spirit in which it rewrites all the past history of the Nation." *

In answer therefore to Welch's question quoted some pages back : " Is it even conceivable that such a thing was ever done ? " we may say that, so far as we have gone, it seems not only conceivable, but rationally probable, that there was some occasion on which the post-exilic Community bound themselves to observe that which they believed to be in essence ' the law of Moses.' To deny its conceivability, as the question seems to invite us to do, is an example of ' extreme historical scepticism ' which is not warranted by the facts as we know them.

2. The second point raised is : Did P ever form an independent writing ? " The Priestly Code," Welch writes, " is said to present a history from the Creation, which

* EXPOSITOR, May 1923, pp. 360–361.

regards everything from the point of view of the origin in the world of Israel's peculiar religion principally as a cult and a law. This book once stood by itself, apart from the earlier accounts, J and E, but was finally amalgamated with these to form our present Pentateuch. Yet as soon as the book is separated from the others and regarded by itself, three questions at least urgently demand explanation and do not receive it." What are these three questions ?

i. The first question is : " If the writers meant their new book to be the official, orthodox account of Israel's past and place in the world, why did they combine it with documents which took a different attitude and which their story was presumably meant to replace ? " Welch gives as an example the story of the Flood. When they " rewrote " it, why did they " interweave " the new with the old and " make the old so integral a part of the new that it could not be superseded and die out ? "

The answer of course is that they did nothing of the kind. As Welch says : " The two accounts are so wholly different in their character that they are the most easily separated of all our duplicate narratives." * The writers of the later account undoubtedly meant to supersede the earlier documents. But, although they meant to do this, they did not succeed. Other and later writers took their story and interwove it with the old. And the explanation is not far to seek. " The spiritual insight of the Church judged more wisely than the learning of the Schools." † The piety of the Jewish people cherished all the materials connected with their early history. That these narratives were frequently contradictory, the one to the other, did not seriously trouble them. Their conception of history was different from ours. The same motive explains the amalgamation of the three

* Expositor, May 1923, p. 362.
† Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, p. lxvii.

main groups of laws in the Pentateuch. "Though much of the P code was really incompatible with the prior institutions, these were not set aside ; they remained as precious monuments of the past." * This seems a very reasonable explanation of the actual fact of the interwoven narrative, and it seems strange that Welch should state that there is none forthcoming.

ii. The second urgent question propounded is based upon a quite reasonable expectation that " if the Priestly Code history was meant to stand alone, it should be able to do so." " No other account," writes Welch, " . . . can be so easily separated. . . . Yet, as soon as this is done . . . it becomes evident that it will not stand alone. It is a mere skeleton, which tumbles at once into a heap without the flesh and sinews which are only supplied by the other accounts. It becomes incredible that so bald a narrative ever stood alone."

This is a matter of opinion rather than of fact. It may seem incredible to Welch, but to others it does not seem at all incredible that the original Priestly writing could and did stand alone. It is obvious that no three documents covering the same ground could be completely preserved and used in a combined narrative. In regard to all three there must be certain omissions, amalgamations and probably transpositions. On the assumption that P was once an independent work, such processes have clearly gone on in the Pentateuch. In all probability, e.g., the birth of Esau and Jacob in P was omitted in favour of the prophecy in J and " in the stories of Jacob and Joseph the curt genealogical method could not be easily combined with the rich variety of JE and considerable rents were consequently caused in the continuity of P." † But when we have taken

---

* Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch*, Ed.¹, vol. i., p. 176.
† *Ibid.*, p. 177.

note of these rents in the fabric, it is at the same time re-
markable how the P fragments and passages, ' pieced
together ' just as they are, do " form a consecutive history
with few lacunæ." *   Skinner has shewn this by printing
" *the disjecta membra* " of P's epitome of the biography of
Abraham, with no connections supplied and with only one
verse transposed.

(*a*) An alternative theory put forward by Orr, which he
adopted from Klostermann, is that the P verses and passages
are the work of an Editor, who supplemented, or recap-
itulated, or set in a framework, the older narrative told in
JE.†   If readers will either study in Skinner's *Commentary*,
or, better still, set down for themselves, the story of
Abraham above mentioned (not, of course, writing out
chapters 17 and 23) it may be safely left to them to decide
" whether a narrative so continuous as this . . . is likely
to have [resulted from putting together] the casual additions
of a mere supplementer." *   If further they will compare
P's story of Creation and J's account of the beginnings of
man (Gen. 1 and 2), the two Flood stories, and the two
accounts of the covenant with Abraham (Gen. 15 and 17)
they will see that it is a complete misnomer to speak of P's
accounts as mere supplements or framework.   They give
quite different representations.   " It is inconceivable that

* Skinner, *Commentary on Genesis*, pp. lviii.–lix., cp. p. xli.   The passages
pieced together are 12[4b-5], 13[6, 11b,] 12[a, b], 19[29], 16[1, 3, 15f,] 17, 21[1b, 2b, 3-5,]
23, 25[7-11].   The thread is thin but continuous ; in 17 and 23 it expands
into full narrative.

† Dahse (Arts. 1 and 2) would have us see in many P verses and short
sections liturgical glosses by which Ezra adapted the Pentateuch for
public reading, but, as Sellin says, " Dahse's attempt to divide up the
whole of the Priestly writing in this way breaks down in face of the long
law-codes and lists, not to speak of many of the narrative portions," and
to my mind Skinner has shewn with irresistible force that the theory
equally breaks down as to the smaller sections.   They are not mere re-
capitulations or headings, and more than half do not occur at the beginning
or end of a Reading (see Skinner, *Divine Names*, pp. 192–228).

a supplementer should contradict his original at every turn and at the same time leave it to tell its own story." On the other hand, if P's narrative was intended to be an independent work and if eventually the Jewish community resolved to retain both old and new and wove them into one, the actual phenomena seem to be adequately explained. This explanation may not satisfy Welch, but he is hardly thereby justified in saying that no explanation is forthcoming.

(b) Another alternative is put forward by Prof. Max Löhr of Königsberg. Löhr * and Sellin † agree that Ezra was the author of the present Pentateuch, and that much of the material in the parts assigned to P was pre-exilic, some indeed as early as that in JE. But from this point they part company. Löhr is of opinion that there never was a continuous document ' P.' Ezra and his friends, he thinks, had at their disposal in Babylonia a large mass of written material of the most heterogeneous character, culled from various quarters, and from this Ezra selected what he wanted and worked it up into the present Pentateuch and brought it in its complete form to Jerusalem. This is a return to the ' Fragmentary theory ' (see Article 1, July, pp. 12–13). He bases it upon supposed variations in the meaning of ' Generations ' and seeming differences of point of view in such P narratives as Gen. 17 (which he divides into four separate sections), etc. These phenomena, so far as they really exist, do indeed reinforce the view already stated, viz. that P was itself to a large extent a compilation based upon written materials, and that these latter had themselves grown by accretion ; but they prove nothing further. We must still hold with Sellin and most modern scholars that P " certainly now bears the impress of a single mind."

---

* Löhr, " Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis," *Z.A.W.*, Beiheft 38 (1924).
† Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, English Translation (1923), pp. 81–96.

Sellin thinks that this document was composed in Baby-
lonia about 500 B.C. and that the narrative portion was
based upon " a pre-exilic historical book of priestly origin,"
while in the legislative portion "everywhere we can see
the old material shewing through the later envelope."
This code and history Ezra brought with him to Jerusalem
in 458. Finding on his arrival that public opinion would
never consent to the throwing aside of JED in favour of
P, he amalgamated the old and the new and produced
substantially the present Pentateuch in 444. There were,
however, certain later additions, such as Ex. 35–40, where
the LXX presents the material "in a completely different
order." * Finally he explains the survival of the old
alongside the new by saying that from the eighth century
at least " the ancient law and the ancient history were
freely reproduced at the popular assemblies for worship."
He cites in proof of this 1 Sa. 7[16] and 12[7ff.], which, he says,
" present Samuel as an itinerant orator appearing in turn
at the ancient sanctuaries of Bethel, Gilgal-Shechem and
Mizpah." This illustrates the loose way in which far-
reaching theories are based by Sellin and others upon quite
inadequate data. There is no evidence whatever that
the speech of Samuel at a political assembly of Israel (in
12) was in any way typical of his doings at the three centres,
which he visited annually as judge, and neither passage
treats of ' popular assemblies for worship,' although we may
well believe that on such occasions sacrifices would be
offered (11[15]). His discussion of the question of the Taber-
nacle (pp. 88–90) suffers in the same way from the flimsy
character of the data upon which he bases his conclusions.

iii. The third ' urgent question ' is as to " the supposed
uniformity of spirit and outlook " in P. This, we are

* See Table in McNeile, *The Book of Exodus* (Westminster Commen-
taries), pp. 223–6.

curtly told, " is simply not true." P's account of the Flood and " Moses' prayer for the people after their sin with the golden calf " are given as two illustrations of " the large outlook " and " the non-legal attitude of some of those who wrote these later and additional accounts." The second of these is described as a " notable illustration " of the heights to which the Priestly writers could rise. But what critical writers assign Ex. 32$^{30-34}$ to P ? The critics known to me assign it to JE, or a JE Editor, long prior to P ! As to the first, surely the fact is that " the supposed uniformity of spirit and outlook " is not supposed at all, in Welch's sense, by the men whose theory he is criticizing. P has its own outlook and way of reading history, but no sensible ex-ponent of the modern view has to my knowledge ever suggested that the Priestly writers were incapable of writing any story of pre-Mosaic days with a large outlook. Well-hausen, e.g., speaks of " the exalted ease and the uniform grandeur that gave the narrative [of Creation] its char-acter." In the narrative of the Flood P's standpoint is clear. Whereas, e.g., JE assumes that the distinction between clean and unclean animals was known in the days of Noah, P believes that it could not have been known before the law was promulgated from Mt. Sinai. Accord-ingly in P's version, " of every living thing of all flesh *two* of every sort, male and female," are brought into the ark (Gen. 6$^{19-20}$, 7$^{14-16}$, ctr. 7^{2-3a}). But this standpoint does not forbid him, rather it helps him, to " think principally of God's relation to the world " as lying beneath and behind " His relation to the chosen race." He believes that there was a covenant with ' all flesh ' as well as a covenant with Israel.* Welch says truly that " nothing could well be

* This is the answer to Eerdmans, who first lays down in an arbitrary manner principles which he attributes to P and then rules out large sections as not P because they seem to contradict these supposed principles. (See Sellin, *Introduction*, pp. 82–3 ; Article 1 (July), p. 21, and Skinner on Genesis, pp. xlii.–xliii.

further away from the narrow limits of late Jewish legalism."
Modern scholars have no controversy with him on this
point. They heartily agree. But when Welch points to
the Book of Jubilees to shew "how the legalists of Jewry
rewrote the origins of the world and of their nation" and
seems to wish his readers to infer that this is "the spirit
and outlook" which critical writers have 'supposed' to
animate the writers of P, it is sufficient to point out that
this book was written in the Maccabean period between
135 and 100 B.C., by a Pharisee of the straitest sect and
at least three, if not four, centuries after P was compiled,
and that no writer on the critical side has ever supposed
that it in any way represented the spirit of the lovers of
the law in the fifth century B.C.

3. We have still to consider the third point, viz. the
nature and date of P, regarded as a code of law. The
modern view has for fifty years regarded it as a post-exilic
production. But, Welch says, "the more it has been
studied by itself in the light of the modern historical method,
the greater are the difficulties which have emerged, *if* it is
to be regarded as uniform in its character and the product
of so late a period"; and again, "the first thing that
emerged was that the book, like Deuteronomy, was not a
unity, but was the outcome of a long development." *

i. There is great virtue in the ' if,' which I have italicized.
' If ' anyone has so regarded P, then undoubtedly difficulties
arise for him. But, we may ask, who has ever so regarded
it ? Certainly not the men, whose theory we are dealing
with. "It is an essential element of the critical position,"
wrote the late Prof. Burney, "that the Priestly Code
embodies ritual usages, which grew up during a long period
and many of which are doubtless of immemorial antiquity.
. . . This is again and again emphasized in the writings

* EXPOSITOR, May 1923, pp. 361 and 363.

of its earliest exponents." Burney justified this statement by a series of quotations.* I must content myself with quoting Wellhausen. As long ago as 1878 he spoke of " a kind of school " of priests as, in and after the Exile, " reducing to writing and to a system that which they had formerly practised in the way of their calling. . . . The Priestly Code is the last result of this labour of many years." It was not a new " creation," but the " systematizing of given materials, and this is what the originality of the Priestly Code in substance amounts to." In his second Edition in 1883 he added a paragraph to deal with the argument that " the laws of the Priestly Code are actually attested everywhere in the practice of the historical period ; that there were always sacrifices and festivals, priests and purifications and everything of the kind in early Israel. " These statements," he says, " must, though it seems scarcely possible, proceed on the assumption that on Graf's hypothesis the whole cultus was invented all at once by the Priestly Code and only introduced after the Exile ! But the defenders of Graf's hypothesis do not go so far as to believe that the Israelite cultus entered the world of a sudden. . . . They merely consider that the works of the law were done before the law, that there is a difference between traditional usage and formulated law, and that this difference . . . has a material basis, being connected with the centralisation of the worship and the hierocracy which that centralisation called into being." † When therefore Welch points out that laws " of a strikingly

---

* Burney in EXPOSITOR, February 1912, quoting Stade (1888) ; Driver, *Introduction*, Ed.⁶, pp. 142–143 ; Kuenen, *Origin, etc., of the Hexateuch* (Engl. transl., 1886, pp. 272, 287) ; Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.* (1881), pp. 383 f. (1892, pp. 382 f.) ; Ryle, *Canon of the Old Testament* (1892), p. 71. To these may be added Skinner on Genesis, p. lvii. ; and, perhaps best of all, Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch* (1900), vol. i., pp. 141–146.

† Wellhausen, *Prolegomena* (English translation from second German Ed.), pp. 404–405, 366, etc.

primitive character such as the ritual of the scapegoat and the offering of the red heifer " lie side by side with others which " are clearly of later date " and that " the code in fact, as a code, has a history behind it, a history of some length and of great complexity " * he is merely stating what had been in fact proclaimed long ago and by none more emphatically than by the critics of the last half century.

ii. It being then agreed that a long development has taken place, the question arises : " where did that development take place, and to what period in the community's life must it be referred ? " †   Welch answers (a) that if all, or even much, of this took place after 444 B.C., it is " extremely difficult to explain how the Samaritans came to accept these later developments," and (b) that, if it took place earlier, it must have been in the period *before* the Exile.   The reasoning here is difficult to follow.   We saw in Article 3 (p. 170) that very possibly the Samaritan schism did not take place till 330 B.C., which allows of one hundred years of development after Ezra-Nehemiah.   But, waiving that possibility, why must we choose between the period after 444 B.C. and the period before 586 ?   There were, according to the usual chronology, about a hundred years between the first return and the days of Ezra, and at least from the days of Zerubbabel, Joshua, Haggai and Zechariah some kind of worship was carried on at Jerusalem.   Why is this period to be ruled out ?   And again there were at least fifty years of exile.   Why is this period also ruled out ?   Welch (following Torrey) answers that " it is inconceivable that the exiles . . . amused themselves by thinking out modifications of a ritual which they were not practising." What about Ezekiel ?   The aim of the argument seems to

* EXPOSITOR, May 1923, p. 363.
† *Ibid.*, p. 363–364.

be to lead us back to pre-exilic days, and the conclusion is reached that "the laws themselves must [for the most part] have existed under the Kingdom, but been reduced to order after the return. They underwent however at this period the minimum of revision. The real revision of individual laws took place before they were codified. There is even less novelty in the code of Ezra than in the code of Josiah." * We note that the codification did take place ' after the return.' But does Welch seriously mean to say that a ' minimum ' of development took place as the result of the Exile and the hundred years which followed the return ? Let us compare the above with the sketch which Wellhausen gives us of the post-exilic " Community once more lifting up its head around the ruined Sanctuary (Hagg. and Zech.)." " The usages and ordinances were, though everywhere changed in detail, yet not created afresh. Whatever creating there was lay in this, that these usages were bound together in a system and made the instrument of restoring an organization of ' the remnant.' Ezekiel first pointed out the way. Thus arose . . . the sacred constitution of Judaism. In the Priestly code we have the picture of it in detail. It is not the case that the hierocracy is based on the code ; that code was only introduced after the hierocracy was already in existence, but it helped, no doubt, to consolidate and legalise it. . . . [In the days of Moses and of the Kings] Old Israel had not shrunk to a religious congregation, . . ., the high priest and the dwelling of Jehovah were not the centre round which all revolved. These great changes were wrought by the destruction of the political existence first of Samaria and then of Judah." † Here surely we have a much truer

* EXPOSITOR, May 1923, p. 365 (very slightly abbreviated).
† Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 421–422 ; cp. Carpenter and Harford, *Hexateuch*, vol. i., pp. 141–146.

estimate of the difference between the two periods before and after the Exile. The Code would not appear very novel in 444 B.C., because it mainly registered changes which had already taken place, but it would have appeared very novel to the men of 'Old Israel.' No doubt laws about the family, food, slavery, leprosy, the Nazarite and the like had been in force in some form or other from very early times, and were revised both before and after the Exile in the light of prophetic teaching. No doubt, again, there was a definite ritual practised at the sanctuaries in N. and S. Israel (Amos 5^{21-23}, 2 Kings 16^{12-16}), but it is by no means clear that in the days of Amos and Ahaz there was a written rule. Priesthoods in many religions have preserved a traditional ritual without possessing a written code.* But there naturally came a time when the priestly 'torah' had to be written down. Exodus 20^{22}–23 and 34, Deut. 12–26 and the Priestly Code represent different stages of codification, and the later stages are marked by the successive elaborations of the laws relating to the Place of worship, the Ministry and the Cult. A great deal of material in P was derived from the ancient time, but a great deal also shews a post-exilic development under foreign rule.

iii. The position of the Pentateuch at the beginning of the Bible necessarily conveyed the impression in pre-critical days that the Law, as it now stands, was given to Israel before their entrance into the land of promise and that the

* Welch on the strength of 2 Kings 17^{26-28} says that it " is known that at least one of these ' uses ' of Bethel or Jerusalem was reduced to writing " (EXPOSITOR, May 1923, p. 365). How is it ' known ' ? No doubt " the returned priest renewed at Bethel the ' use ' which Amos had witnessed," but all that 2 Kings says is that " he taught them how they should fear Yahweh." There is not the slightest proof that he brought with him a written code. " The manner of the God of the land " is contrasted with " the manner of the nations " (ver ^{33}). Was the latter also a written code ?

messages of the prophets came after it. When critical study had revealed the fact that the Law was a composite Book and in its present form was post-exilic, it was realized that ' the Law did not precede the prophets ; the prophets preceded the Law.' This, as we have seen did not mean that there was no law until after the prophets. Sacrifices there always were ; social regulations necessarily took shape as soon as social and national life began ; Moses, Samuel and their like delivered oral judgments ; Priests developed traditional usage at the Sanctuaries ; but all this was not formulated law. It was not apparently written down and published in code form until a late period in the national history. Welch * well pictures to us " the prophetic revelation playing upon the cult, criticising it, refining it, interpreting it," and he gives us two interesting pages (based upon Gunkel's work on the Psalms), shewing how psalms and formulæ and prophetic oracles, used or uttered at the time of sacrifice, would tend to introduce to the minds of the worshippers higher conceptions of Yahweh. " It may be even said that the cult, as it came to exist in later Israel, was largely the outcome of the prophet's work." Why, after saying this, Welch should go on to say that " this implies that the sharp antithesis . . . ' the law did not precede the prophets ; the prophets preceded the law ' is ceasing to have much meaning so largely must it be modified " is a mystery ; it would seem to imply the opposite, and in the very next sentence he actually gives the true meaning of this dictum and practically declares it to be true : " the law, *as it came to be and as it exists* may have succeeded the prophets." Exactly ; that is just what the scholars who propounded it meant and said, and nothing that has been said to the contrary has shaken this their position.

* EXPOSITOR, May 1923, pp. 366–368.

iv. In bringing this series of articles to a close, I should like, at the end as at the beginning, to thank Prof. Welch for having sent us back to examine foundations. We sought to enter upon these investigations with an open mind, ready to give full weight to all that could be said on either side, but I think that most of my readers will agree with me that, when all is said, the writers whom he has quoted and others whose writings we have considered have not ' seriously shaken ' the main pillars of the modern view. They may have in certain cases helped us to see more clearly some of the steps in the living process of development which lies behind the Pentateuch as we now possess it, but that is another matter. Dr. S. A. Cook * believes " that Old Testament criticism is passing into a new phase." It is true that, e.g., with regard to early Canaanitish religion archæology is shedding new light, but the bearing of the new material upon the pre-prophetic religion of Israel is by no means clear. In any case the ' new phase,' if it establishes itself, does not seem likely to be in the direction of more conservative positions.†

* See *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1924 and January 1925 ; *The Religion of Ancient Palestine*, 2000 to 1000 B.C. (Constable). See also Kittel, *The Religion of the People of Israel*, chap. i (Allen & Unwin, 1925).

† I would like to commend to my readers the article by my brother on *Leviticus* in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iii., as shewing how critical studies light up the Law and provide (§ 7) material for spiritual edification. See also Prof. Moffatt's *The Approach to the New Testament*, pp. 235–236, and Prof. Peake's *A Guide to Biblical Study*, pp. 12–16 (" The chief aim of the study of the Old Testament is not to analyse the Hexateuch into its component parts, but to understand the course which was taken in the education of Israel to prepare for the coming of Christ ").