

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE HISTORY AND METHOD OF PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM.

THE history of the Pentateuch controversy is a long and changeful one, even though we overlook its earlier pages. Nevertheless, if it be true of this history as Cicero asserted of all history,¹ that it is "the witness of the ages and the light of truth," then even its beginnings ought not to remain unnoticed. It is accordingly the purpose of the following pages again to call attention to these earliest stages of Pentateuchal criticism.

Philo and Josephus appear to have been still unaware of any discussion on the Pentateuch. At any rate, both of them assumed that Moses had written even the last eight verses of Deuteronomy. The most important of the interesting words in which they set forth this opinion are as follows: Philo writes in the Life of Moses (3, 39), "Most wonderful of all is the end of the sacred literature (*i.e.*, the Pentateuch), which, as in the case of a living creature, is the head of the whole legislation. For when he (Moses) was already withdrawn, and standing at the very end of his course, at that moment, being inspired with Divine ecstasy from above, while still alive, he declared accurately as a *Prophet* the circumstances following his death, *viz.*, that he had ended his earthly course (although he was not yet dead) and that he was buried, without any one being present, etc." Josephus (*Antiq.*, IV. 8, 48) writes thus: "Moses in the sacred books wrote that he had died because he was afraid lest men exaggerating his achievements, should dare to assert that he had withdrawn into a state of Divine being (*πρὸς τὸ θεῖον*)."

¹ Cicero de Oratore, II. 36. "*Historia (est) testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriæ, magistra vitæ, nuntia vetustatis,*" etc.

therefore is that Moses as Prophet was *able* to describe his final earthly experiences, while Josephus held that Moses described his own death and burial out of modesty in order to prevent his own apotheosis. According to their actual language, it is clear that neither of these writers knew anything of a Pentateuch discussion. At the same time do not their expressions offer the suggestion that even in their days the question as to the original author of the last section of the Pentateuch had actually been raised? We shall not be surprised therefore to find that in the Talmud the existence of this question is assumed, inasmuch as, without being expressly stated, it meets at once with a reply.

Such is the case in the Talmud *Bababathra*.¹ After a discussion on the arrangement of the Old Testament books, it runs: "And who wrote them (these books)? Moses wrote his book, and the Parashe upon Balaam (the section, Num. xxii.-xxiv.), and (the book of) Job. Joshua wrote his book and eight verses which are contained in the Torah." The reference is to Deuteronomy xxxiv. 5-12. In the discussion arising out of this text, the following statement is made to establish the decision which had been given in regard to these eight verses. "It is impossible that Moses was alive and wrote (at the identical time), 'and there he died.' But Moses wrote up to that point; from that point onwards Joshua. These are the words of Rabbi Judah (the Holy, the editor of the Mishna), or, as others say, of Rabbi Nehemiah. Rabbi Simeon said to him, 'It cannot be that the law was lacking in a single letter, seeing that it is written (Deut. xxxi. 26), *Take this book of the Law; rather up to that point* was the Holy One (blessed be He) speaking and Moses writing, (and) *from that point* was the

¹ Fol. 14b, 15a. Cf. Marx-Dalman, *Traditio rabbinorum veterima*, 1884. The further contents of this important passage will be found translated and discussed in my *Einleitung in das Alte Testament, mit Einschluss der Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A. T.* (1893), pp. 445 f., 458.

Holy One (blessed be He) speaking and Moses writing *in tears.*'”

Some light is thrown on the inference drawn by Rabbi Simeon from the words, “Take this book of the law,” by the fact that in *other* books of the Old Testament the account of the death of the particular author is not ascribed to *himself*. Thus it is stated further on in this section of the Talmud, “Joshua wrote his book, and (=but) whereas it is written, ‘And Joshua, the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord, died’ (Josh. xxiv. 29), *that* was added by Eleazar. Again, whereas it is written, ‘And Eleazar, the son of Aaron, died’ (Josh. xxiv. 33), *that* was added by Phinehas and the Elders. Again, he (the authority for the passage of the Talmud under discussion) has said, ‘The Lord Samuel wrote his book,’ and (=but) whereas it is written, ‘And Samuel died’ (1 Sam. xxviii. 3), *that* was added by Gad the Seer and Nathan the Prophet.” It is clear that in these passages, which are *wholly analogous* to Deuteronomy xxxiv. 5 ff., the opinion was not maintained that the account of each particular person’s death was recorded by himself. We cannot, therefore, be surprised if Rabbi Simeon’s conclusion, from Deuteronomy xxxi. 26, that *Moses had related his own death*, found no defender in the following centuries.

The narrative of Moses’ death, his burial, and his unique position in the roll of the prophets (Deut. xxxiv. 5–12) was therefore the first element in the Pentateuch which was established as a post-Mosaic *addendum*. It is further related that about the year 900 a Jew, Isaac (ibn Jashûsh) denied to Moses the words, “These are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom before there reigned any king over the children of Israel” (Gen. xxxvi. 31).¹ This Isaac

¹ The identity of the Jewish scholar, so often named only “Isaac,” with Isaac ibn Jashûsh, is accepted by Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VI. 47, and also by S. Poznanski, *Mose ben Samuel ha-Kohen, etc.*, 1895, p. 28, note 6.

stated his opinion upon Gen. xxxvi. 31 ff. more definitely thus, that this section was written in the time of King Jehoshaphat. This special dating of the section referred to may have given to Ibn Ezra († 1167) the occasion for the sharp judgment upon Isaac which he expresses in his Commentary on Genesis (contained, for example, in Buxtorf's edition of the Rabbinic Bible). He adds satirically that this writer was well called Yizchaq, *i.e.*, "Laugher," since he was laughed at by every one who heard him. It little became Ibn Ezra to condemn the other so severely. For he himself acknowledged in the first place (on Gen xii. 6) that the remark, "and the Canaanite was *then* in the land," shows that Canaan had been wrested out of the hand of another, and that, if it were not so, then a mystery lay upon the word "then," concerning which a man of prudence would hold his peace. Further, in commenting on Deuteronomy i. 1, he pointed out as singularly mysterious elements in the Pentateuch the words, "as it is said to this day," etc. (Gen. xxii. 14), and "stands not the bed of King Og in Bashan?" etc. (Deut. iii. 11). Finally, Ibn Ezra explained Deuteronomy xxxiv. 5 thus, "As far as I know, the fact is that Joshua wrote what follows." Isaac Abrabanel also († 1508), in his commentary on the Pentateuch, found it strange that "this side of Jordan" is several times written instead of "on the far side of Jordan" (Gen. i. 11 ff.; Deut. i. 1, 5; iii. 8, 20, 25, etc.).¹

Outside Judaism also it was the narrative of the death of Moses, in the first place, which gave occasion for subtracting from the Mosaic authorship of the whole Pentateuch. Such was the case in the third of the twenty Clementine Homilies belonging to the second century A.D. (cf. § 47). According to this authority, Moses wished to propagate

¹ All these passages in the Pentateuch and many others are fully discussed in my *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, with reference to all recent opinions and criticisms.

the early religion by word of mouth alone, and entrusted the law to seventy wise men. But after his death the law, contrary to his intention, was written down, and the Pentateuch was the result. That this written Pentateuch is not to be derived from Moses himself is clear from the narrative of his death (Deut. xxxiv. 5). In later times also the Pentateuch was frequently destroyed, and re-written with additions. Some knowledge of these Jewish-Christian views may also have reached the ears of Celsus, so that he held the view which Origen ascribes to him, that "the Pentateuch does not come down from Moses, but from some other persons" (*Contra Celsum*, iv. 42). A touch of criticism of the absolute Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch may be found also in the remark of Jerome to Helvidius, "Whether you call Moses the originator of the Pentateuch, or Ezra its renovator, I reject neither."¹

These words contain an echo of the statement, which must not be overlooked (Ezra vii. 11, 14), that Ezra came out of Babylon in order to teach commandments and statutes in Israel, and that in accordance with the law of his God "which was in his hand" (which he brought with him). Even in the mediæval Church, in which so many older traditions had been overrun with later ones, Nicholas of Lyra (+ 1340) in his "*Postilla Perpetua in Biblia*" on Deuteronomy i. 1, does not suppress the suspicion arising from the fact that Moses had handed over the law to the Levites (xxxi. 9), and yet the Pentateuch continued further.

Nevertheless, as it was in general the main work of the Reformers to lead men back to the oldest historical sources, so it was their task to bring again to remembrance those points of tradition which bore upon the origin of the Pentateuch. The first word came from that theologian before

¹ The entire series of statements relating to this subject in the Talmud, etc., and in the Fathers (Clem. Alex., Iren., Tert., Hier., Aug.) ("Ezra restored again the law which had been burnt in the Temple archives by the Chaldeans") is printed in my *Einleitung*.

whom Luther took the oath when in 1512 he received the degree of Doctor of Holy Scripture. In his book on the canonical writings (1520) he said (§ 81)¹: "It is certain that Moses gave the law received from God to the people, but to whom belong the wording (*dictio*) and the core of the narrative (*orationis filum*), that is open to doubt." He added further (§ 85), "The position can be defended that Moses was not the author (*scriptor*) of the five books, because after the burial of Moses we find the same narrative-core (*orationis filum*) but not the same Moses." If one were inclined to treat Carlstadt as a solitary case, one should remember that Luther also, in the lectures on Genesis, which he delivered in the last years of his life (1536-1545) used these words: "It is a question whether these kings lived before or after Moses; if they lived after Moses, then this cannot have been written by him,² but must be an addition (*additio*) made by another, such as we find in the last section of Deuteronomy. For Moses did not say concerning himself, 'There arose not another after Moses with whom God spake face to face' (Deut. xxxiv. 5-12), nor that other word concerning the grave of Moses, etc., unless indeed we say (*nisi dicas*) that by the help of the spirit of prophecy he foresaw and foretold these things." Further, Petrus Palladius, "faithful hearer, and true disciple of Luther and Melanchthon," the first evangelical writer of an Introduction to the Old Testament,³ declared that the name "Book of Moses" might very well be meant to express that these books had Moses for a subject.

¹ *Carlstadii libellus de canonicis scripturis*, reprinted in Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, 1847.

² "*Non potuit ipse haec scribere.*" By the indicative Luther expresses his own judgment. By the conjunctive which he uses once he indicates an opinion which was not his own. How the question raised by Luther is to be answered, whether those Edomite kings in Genesis are to be placed before or after Moses, is discussed in detail in my *Einleitung*, p. 160 f.

³ Concerning its author and its interesting history, see the whole passage which is quoted from Walter, *Officina biblica* in my *Einleitung*, p. 6.

But beginning from the 16th and 17th centuries, several scholars of the Roman Church also have expressed themselves in similar terms. For example, Andreas Masius wrote in the preface to his commentary on the Book of Joshua, which was published at Antwerp in 1574 (p. 2): "Vain and false (*futilis commenticiaque*) is the opinion of the ancient Jews, which they have left in their Talmud, concerning the author of their holy books. I at least am prepared to assume that Ezra, either alone or in concert with contemporaries who possessed remarkable piety and learning, being breathed upon by the heavenly spirit (*afflatum*, referring to Ezra), compiled (*compilasse*) not only the book of Joshua, but also the book of Judges, the book of the Kings, and other books of the holy Bible out of various annals which had been preserved among the congregation of God. Nay, indications may easily be pointed out which show that the work of Moses which is called the Pentateuch, was both stitched together (*sarcitum*) and made clearer long after the time of Moses by the interpolation of words and clauses (*interjectis saltem hic illic verborum et sententiarum clausulis*). For, to mention only one such suggestion, Cariath-arbe is often called Hebron (Qirjath-Arba, Judg. i. 10; Hebron from Gen. xiii. 18 onwards), and nevertheless important (*graves*) authorities relate that this name was attached to the town by Hebron, the son of Caleb." In like manner the Jesuit Bonfrère also wrote in his *Pentateuchus Moysis commentario illustratus ab Jacobo Bonfrerio*, Antwerp, 1625 (p. 93): "In Numbers xxi. 14, 15, a 'book of the wars of the Lord' is quoted, and reference seems to be made to narratives which were written in this book of events which took place after the death of Moses. I will readily admit that the last chapter (the whole *ultimum caput!*) of Deuteronomy was not written by Moses himself, but was added by another, whether this was Joshua or Ezra (!), supposing that Moses himself had not, as Philo and

Josephus would have it, written thus concerning himself before his death (*scripserit*, conjunct.!). Numbers xii. 3 appears incompatible with the modesty of Moses (*a Moysis modestia alienum*).¹ That the name of Hebron was given to the town by Caleb's son is held by many not without reason. 'Dan' is mentioned from Genesis xiv. 14 onwards, and yet this name was given to the town long after the death of Moses (Judg. xviii. 29). But there is nothing to forbid the assertion that these and other small sentences of a like character were subsequently (*postea*) inserted in their several places by the writers of sacred books (*ab hagiographis scriptoribus*), and that only the body (*corpus*) of these books, with the exception of those few portions which were added later, was shaped (*efformatum*) by Moses."

Although we have traced the history of Pentateuch investigation only as far as the seventeenth century, it is plain that the controversy was not the fruit of caprice, and that it did not spring in a moment out of a single head. Rather is it the case that in the course of the centuries, with long breaks intervening, expositors alike of Jewish and of Christian persuasion, whose points of view were otherwise far apart, nevertheless in like degree detected traces which drew attention to the fact that Moses did not write the whole of the Pentateuch as it lies before us.

Now that the glance at the past history of Pentateuchal investigation which has been here afforded has established the results just described, that history need be pursued no further for the present, however rich be the materials at my disposal for its further development. But I must add to this historical portion of my paper, what I may call a systematic portion.

¹ Bonfrère probably understood Numbers xii. 3 with the Vulgate: "And the man Moses was the meekest beyond all men who were upon earth" (*Mitissimus super omnes homines*); more accurate would be "extraordinarily meek (*ânâw*), more than all men," etc.

Still more important than a glance back at the history of the investigation is an examination and testing of certain fundamental presuppositions of the literary analysis of the Pentateuch. For, to take an example, it is always worth while to raise anew the question, whether an investigation of the external development of the Pentateuch, as we have it, is at all possible in view of the condition of the text, and if this question can be answered in the affirmative, whether in the next place the *linguistic* characteristics of the Pentateuch provide a trustworthy basis for a judgment upon the literary origin of the books.

The first question of all runs thus: Does the text of the Old Testament, which we have received, possess qualities which warrant us in regarding it not only as at least relatively well preserved, but also as permitting us to reach back to the original sources on which it rests? In answer to this question I would direct attention in the first place to something which lies outside the Pentateuch. In the historical section (2 Kings xviii. 13—chap. xx.) it is found that the name of Hezekiah occurs five times in the shorter form *Chizqiya*, and twenty-nine times in the longer form *Chizqiyyahu*. Now, are these two forms mixed one with another throughout this section? No, the five cases of the shorter form are all in 2 Kings xviii. 14–16; while the twenty-nine of the longer form are found in xviii. 13, 17 ff. down to chap. xx. Now it happens that the historical section (2 Kings xviii. 13 to chap. xx.) is also included in Isaiah xxxvi.–xxxix., but *these three verses* (2 Kings xviii. 14–16) in which the shorter form *Chizqiya* occurs five times, are wanting in the parallel (Isa. xxxvi.–xxxix.)! Their absence from Isaiah already marks these three verses as a section standing by itself; this section has had a separate existence, and a fate of its own, since just these three have not been taken up into the book of Isaiah. These three verses present the narrative of another source, and the same

three verses, and *only they*, in contrast to the foregoing and the following narrative, contain the shorter form of Hezekiah's name. This is a fact of far-reaching significance. It proves not only that the presentations of a historical event in separate sources are distinguishable from one another by linguistic differences, but also that these distinctions of form have been preserved in the handing down of the text.

The same can be shown by means of a large number of other passages. Passing over the linguistic distinctions between the historical books with which Chronicles runs parallel, and the Book of Chronicles itself, I will further allude only to formal peculiarities of the prophetic books. I adduce only the following. The expression "rising up early," *i.e.*, "earnestly," occurs in Jeremiah vii. 13—"I, God, spoke most earnestly to you," 25; xi. 7; xxv. 3, 4; xxvi. 5; xxix. 19; xxxii. 33; xxxiv. 15; xxxv. 14, 15; and xlv. 4; and yet opportunity for the use of this expression might well have occurred to other prophets also, *e.g.*, Ezekiel. Again, the word-series "sword, famine, pestilence" is employed: Jeremiah xiv. 12; xxiv. 10; xxvii. 8, 13; xxix. 17, 18; xxxii. 24, 36; xxxviii. 2; xlii. 17, 22; xlv. 13. The same series is found in Ezekiel vi. 11; vii. 15*b*; and xii. 16; but other arrangements are *peculiar to him*, v. 12, 17; vi. 12; vii. 15*a*; and he employed this threat altogether less frequently, *cf.* xiv. 13, 17. Again, "to drive the people into exile," is in Jeremiah *hiddiach*, viii. 3; xvi. 15; xxiii. 2, 3, 8, 12; xxiv. 9; xxvii. 10, 15; xxix. 14, 18; xxx. 17; xxxii. 37; xl. 12; xliii. 5; xlvi. 28; xlix. 25, 36; l. 17, and *hediach*, li. 34. In Ezekiel this word is found in iv. 13, but for the same idea also *hêphis*, combined with *zara'* (scatter), *cf.* xxix. 12; xxx. 23, 26. For a final example, "to deliver the impenitent Israelites to a curse," is a phrase of Jeremiah xxiv. 9; xxv. 9, 18; xxvi. 6; xxix. 18; xlii. 18; xlv. 8, 12, 22; xlix. 13,

Jeremiah and Ezekiel have a linguistic peculiarity in common in the second person singular of the perfect, ending with the old dialectical termination *i*. This form appears in other parts of the Old Testament: (? Judg. v. 7) Ruth iii. 3 f.; 2 Kings iv. 23 (story of Elisha; Central Palestine); Micah iv. 13; Jeremiah ii. 20, 33; iii. 4 f.; iv. 19; xiii. 21; xxii. 23; xxxi. 21; xlvi. 11; Ezekiel xvi. 13, 18, 20, 22, 31, 36, 43, 47, 51. This gives proof also that the linguistic form of the Old Testament has not been smoothed down. But Ezekiel, on his side, also has a considerable number of linguistic peculiarities; for example, frequent cases of the infinitive with the feminine termination (v. 6; viii. 6; xv. 4; xvi. 55; xxii. 3; xxvii. 10; xxxiii. 12; xxxiv. 11), and also infinitives terminating in *ith* (xxiv. 26), or, as in Aramaic, with *m* prefixed (xvii. 9; xxxvi. 5). In the same prophet we find also the plural termination *in* (Ezek. iv. 9; xxvi. 18), a further indication of the influence of some popular dialect of Aramaic character. This prophet describes his experience of a Divine impulse with the phrase, "The hand of the Lord was upon me" (i. 3; iii. 22; x. 8; xxxvii. 1; xl. 1). The Israelites are described by him, and by him alone (except Isa. xxx. 9), as a "a rebellious house," "a house of stubbornness" (ii. 5, 6, 7, 8; iii. 9, 26, 27; xii. 2, 3, 9; xvii. 12; xxiv. 3). Finally, in Ezekiel the prophet is addressed by God as "Son of man" (ii. 1, etc., about ninety-two times).

All these formal peculiarities of Ezekiel might have been employed by Jeremiah also, and, what is of chief importance, might have been transferred from one book to the other by later editors and transcribers. The fact that this did not take place is a proof that the transmission of the Old Testament text was, to a very high degree, conservative.

The very same characteristics of the text are made

manifest if the remaining books of the Old Testament are compared with the Pentateuch; and finally, if the separate parts of the Pentateuch are compared with one another. For example, the plural termination *in* is found as follows (taking the Hebrew books in reverse order): Daniel xii. 13; Lamentations i. 4; Job iv. 2, etc. (thirteen times); Proverbs xxxi. 3; Ezekiel iv. 9; xxvi. 18; Micah iii. 12; 2 Kings xi. 13; 1 Kings xi. 33 (2 Sam. xxi. 20, *k'thib*); Judges v. 10; but not in the Pentateuch. Or take the pronunciation of the preposition *min* as simple *me* before the article. This appears most commonly in Chronicles (eight times), in Ezra five times, and so through the Old Testament back to Judges (five times) and Joshua (five times), but in the whole Pentateuch, on the other hand, only once (*meha'oph*, Gen. vi. 20); and even in this case the Samaritan Pentateuch gives the form *min*. Or take the expression *hêkhal* for temple, "House of Jehovah." It occurs in Chronicles (eight), Nehemiah (three), Ezra (three), and so on back to Kings (eleven times). It is used also in 2 Samuel xxii. 7 and 1 Samuel i. 9; iii. 3; that is to say, in the period before the building of the Temple. But in no single case has it been carried back into the Pentateuch. It would have been still more natural if a name of God, which was quite common in one part of the Old Testament, had been inserted into the other parts in its later editions; but the Divine name "Jahve Sebaoth," which appears frequently from 1 Samuel i. 3 onwards (in Samuel eleven times), has nevertheless in no single case been carried over into the book of Judges, Joshua, or the Pentateuch; and that in spite of the fact that the use of the name "Jahve" itself *suggested* the addition of "Sebaoth," while many passages of the Pentateuch actually *invited* its insertion; e.g., Exodus xii. 41 f., where the subject is the hosts of the Lord, or Exodus xv. 3, where Jahve is glorified as God of war. But we can

point also to the converse, namely, that a linguistic phenomenon which is common in the Pentateuch, is absent from the later writings of the Old Testament. For example, I have observed that the repetition of the time-measure, as in "nine hundred years and thirty years" (Gen. v. 5), occurs forty-one times in the Pentateuch, but that this formula is used *for the last time* in 1 Kings vi. 1. It is never used in the countless enumerations which follow this passage in the Old Testament, not once in Ezekiel, Ezra, Nehemiah, or Chronicles!

Further, *within* the Pentateuch itself, the Mount of lawgiving is always called Horeb in Deuteronomy (i. 2, 6, 19; iv. 10, 15; v. 2; ix. 8; xviii. 26; xxviii. 69; *exception* in the poetical passage, xxxiii. 2). Never called Sinai in Deuteronomy, this is the name it bears in Numbers x. 12; ix. 3; iii. 1; i. 1, and Leviticus xxvii. 34; xxvi. 46; xxv. 1, and never Horeb. (On Exodus, see my *Einleitung*, p. 170 f.) Or take the expression for "eleven." Compounded with "*ashtë*," which has been discovered again in Assyrian, it occurs Exodus xxvi. 7, 8; xxxvi. 14, 15; Numbers vii. 72; xxix. 20, but only once as an ordinal number in Deuteronomy (i. 3). Compounded with *achad(t)*, it occurs in Genesis xxxii. 33; xxxvii. 9; Deuteronomy i. 2. (These passages include *all* those in which "eleven" appears in the Pentateuch).¹ Again the expression for "beget" is provided by the stem *jalad* in Genesis iv. 18 (three times); x. 8, 13, 15, 24, 26, *i.e.* throughout one whole chapter, where, on the other hand, the derived stem *holid* is not once used. But the latter form is used in Genesis v. 3 f., 6 f., 9 f., 12 f., etc., to v. 30 f.; and also in xi. 10, 11, 12, etc., to v. 26. Thus *holid* also is found in whole chapters which do not

¹ "Eleven" *outside* the Pentateuch is = *ashtë 'asar (esrê)* 2 Kings xxv. 2; Jer. i. 3; xxxix. 2; lii. 5; Ezek. xxvi. 1; xl. 49; Zech. i. 7; 1 Chron. xiii. 13; xxiv. 12; xxv. 18; xxvii. 14—but = *achad 'asar (achat 'esrê)* Josh. xv. 51; 1 Kings vi. 38; 2 Kings ix. 29; xxiii. 36; xxiv. 18; Jer. lii. 1; Ezek. xxx. 20; xxxi. 1; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 5. 11. See further my *Einleitung*, p. 230 seq., and my *Lehrgebäude*, II., p. 211 seqq.

show a single case of *jalad*. (The other cases are tabulated in my *Einleitung*.) In like manner, the name *Elohim* occurs thirty-five times in Genesis i. 1-ii. 3, *Jahve* not once. On the other hand, in the narrative section iv. 1-16 *Jahve* occurs eight times and *Elohim* not once. (Further particulars in my *Einleitung*.) In connection with these peculiarities of expression also, it is not only the fact of their existence which is of importance, but yet more, that they *have been preserved* in the transmission of the text. And the authority of the Hebrew Old Testament is confirmed in regard to the last-mentioned distinction by the Samaritan Pentateuch. Concerning the Divine names *Elohim* and *Jahve*, I find there up to Exodus vi. 4 only the following divergences: *Jahve* appears instead of *Elohim* in cc. vii. 9; xxviii. 4; xxxi. 9, 16; and conversely *Elohim* for *Jahve* in cc. xiv. 22; xx. 18; Exodus iii. 4. Over against the unanimous testimony of many hundreds of passages of Genesis in the Hebrew and Samaritan texts (excepting the few cases just mentioned) the witness of the Hellenistic Old Testament cannot claim a hearing. The force of *its* testimony is further weakened by the peculiarity it displays in the use of the Divine names. For after moving in conformity with the Hebrew-Samaritan text in regard to the thirty-five cases of "Elohim" in Genesis i. 1-ii. 3, the Septuagint diverges in chap. iv. thus: for "*Jahve*" in v. 1 it gives *ὁ Θεός*, but in v. 3 *Κύριος*, in v. 4 again *Θεός*, in vv. 6, 9, 13, 15, *Κύριος ὁ Θεός*, and in v. 16 once more *Θεός*. Here it is easy to ascertain which is the original. For in the Hebrew and in the Samaritan Pentateuch we have the consistent use of the Divine names in combination with other characteristics in the presentation of these sections. Further, the Samaritan Pentateuch, which otherwise diverges so often from the Hebrew and *agrees* with the Septuagint, would not conversely agree with the Hebrew and diverge from the Septuagint in regard to the Divine

names, if this agreement did not rest upon the original wording. (A thorough examination of the significance of the LXX. and the other old versions for the history of the text will be found in my *Einleitung*.)

It follows from the proofs already adduced that an affirmative answer may be given to the first of the preliminary questions raised above, viz. : whether the traditional text of the Old Testament has been preserved in at least relatively good condition, and specially, whether it admits of any inference being drawn as to sources which may underlie it. The traditional Hebrew Old Testament possesses in poetry, oratory and prose, and again in the several books of history an endless number of linguistic peculiarities, which might easily have been smoothed away, *if* later generations had set out on such an undertaking of assimilation. Now, since this has *not* been the case,—since, for example, the linguistic form of *Chronicles* diverges in the most striking features from the form of *Samuel* and *Kings*, the proof is provided that the Old Testament text, at any rate, offers a basis for the investigation of its literary origins by means of the formal peculiarities of its several parts.

The second preliminary question in Pentateuchal investigation which I intended to raise, is this : whether the linguistic peculiarities of the Pentateuch actually afford a trustworthy ground-work for conclusions as to its genesis and development. This question also can, I think, be answered with sufficient certainty by the aid of the material presented above.

I select, for example, the above-mentioned distinction of usage between *jalah* and *holid*. The former is used exclusively throughout Genesis x. (the “table of the nations”), and the latter in the whole passage, Genesis xi 10-26 (genealogy of the Semites). I once held a correspondence concerning this distinction with the late Professor Dillmann, with whom I had been intimate since the time of my

Ethiopic studies. He wrote to me, and afterwards published in his Commentary on Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua (1886, p. 664) that those who used *hōlid* for "beget" wished to express the idea *more definitely*. But how can we say that those who used *jalad* of the man did not wish to express with perfect definiteness *aliquem generasse*? The narrator in Genesis iv. 18, who three times used *jalad* for "beget," evidently intended to express the idea just as definitely as the narrator of v. 3 ff., where *hōlid* is used. Dillmann appears to me, moreover, to have overlooked a passage like Psalms ii. 7, where the same word *jalad* is used for "beget." When, however, he says, in the passage above cited, that the "doctors of the law" would have preferred the expression *hōlid*, it is not easy to perceive how an ordinary writer sufficed for the register of the descendants of Japhet, Ham and Shem, in Genesis x., where only *jalad* is used, whereas a "doctor of the law" was required for the register of Shem's descendants in Genesis xi. 10-26. Another solution of the problem of the varying usage of *jalad* and *hōlid* will be found if we examine the actual usage of the whole Old Testament in reference to this distinction. This I have done in my *Einleitung*. One can observe there how the linguistic usage gradually tended towards a preference for the derived stem, *hōlid*. In the choice between *jalad* and *hōlid* it is not therefore a question of definiteness or indefiniteness, but of an advancing progress in linguistic usage.

That this development in Hebrew usage did actually take place, may be seen from what has been remarked above concerning the repetition of the measure of numbers (*e.g.*, "nine hundred years and thirty years"). This repetition occurs in the Pentateuch thirty-three times, then not till 1 Kings vi. 1, and after that not once again. On the other hand, we have Vav consecutive with the lengthened imperfect in the Pentateuch only in Genesis xxxii. 6; xli.

11; xliii. 21; and Numbers viii. 19; but in the memoirs of Ezra (vii. 27-ix. 15) in vii. 28; viii. 15, 16, 17 (twice), 23 (twice), 24, 25, 26, 28, 31; ix. 3 (twice), 5, 6. We must also bear in mind that in regard to the use of the two forms *anokhi* and *anî* for "I" the historical books of the Old Testament stand thus to one another. The books of Samuel contain about fifty instances of *anokhi* and about fifty of *anî*. In Kings the proportion of the two forms is as 9 to 44, in Ezra as 0 to 2, in Nehemiah as 1 to 15, in Chronicles as 1 to 30. The same progress of linguistic usage shows itself in the prophetic books; for the proportion of *anokhi* to *anî* is in Amos as 10 to 1, in Hosea (more Central-Palestinian) as 11 to 10, in Jeremiah as 37 to 53, in Ezekiel as 1 to 138, in Daniel as 1 to 23, in Haggai as 0 to 4, in Zechariah (cc. 1-8) as 0 to 8, and in Malachi as 1 to 5. The complete series, with references to all the passages in all the books of the Old Testament, will be found in my *Einleitung*, where I have also shown fully how the Decalogue, the Book of the Covenant, Deuteronomy, and the other main sources of the Pentateuch, are related to each other in respect of their usage of these forms.

In order to give at least one proof out of the domain of Syntax I select the following example. In the expression, "supposing that," or "in case that" (*kî*, 'asher) "a man does so and so," the natural arrangement which places the *conjunction* first, and not "a man, etc.," is found in Exodus xxi. 7, 14, 20, 28, 33, 35, 37; xxii. 4, 6, 9, 13, 15. Thus in the Book of the Covenant this order is universal, "in case" or "if" any one. The same arrangement meets us in Leviticus xx. 9; in Deuteronomy xix. 11; xxii. 13, 28; xxiii. 11; xxiv. 1, 5, 7. On the other hand, *the other arrangement*, "a man, etc., in case (or if) he" is used in Leviticus i. 2; ii. 1; iv. 2 (not *vv.* 13, 22); v. 1, 2, 4, 15, 21; vii. 21; xii. 2; xiii. 9 (and—with a complication in so

far as the antecedent noun is not in the nominative but had to have a preposition before it; *casus absolutus*—Lev. xiii. 2, 18, 24, 29, 38, 40, 42); Leviticus xv. 2, 16; xix. 20 (xx. 10–21, again with this complication); xx. 27; xxi. 9 (17), etc., in the *Law of Holiness*, e.g. xxiv. 19; xxv. 26, 29; then after this *corpusculum juris* still further xxvii. 2, 14; Numbers v. 6, 12; vi. 2; ix. 10; xix. 20; xxvii. 8; xxx. 3. The same arrangement of words is found, however (apart from the somewhat different case in Micah v. 4), in Ezekiel (ii. 5) xviii. 5, as also in the Mishna, “a bridegroom, if he” (*Berachoth*, ii. 8; also iii. 6).

In this way the second also of the two questions raised above is answered. It has been shown by means of some plain examples that the Hebrew language of the Old Testament is no exception to the fate of other languages, in consequence of which they have undergone a more or less rapid change in regard to their accidence and their syntax.

The proofs which have now been offered establish in the main the following three points:—

(a) Particular sections of the Old Testament, e.g., the special narrative-source in 2 Kings xviii. 14–16, are distinguishable from other narratives on linguistic grounds.

(b) These distinctions have been preserved throughout the transmission of the text.

(c) The distinctions as regards form in the Old Testament make it possible to recognise a history of the Hebrew language.

Beyond this I am able, on the ground of exhaustive observations, to add that the ascertainable history of the Hebrew language runs parallel to the development of other languages in regard to sounds, forms and syntax.

My *Syntax of the Hebrew Language* will illustrate this in connection with the nomenclature and the use of the accusative with the full light of historical and comparative

philology. If the question be now asked, what conclusions may be drawn from all this for the investigation of the Pentateuch, I must refer to my *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. For I have no right, any more than another, to publish elsewhere the contents of that book.¹ Only one thing I would still add. Let no one confuse literary criticism with the negations derived from *Religionsgeschichte*. For it is a misfortune that the two things are not always properly kept apart. Let it not be forgotten also that I have sought one side of my life-work in defending a truly transcendental Revelation, and that I have written a book "against the evolutionary theorists."

ED. KÖNIG.

*JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK, AND
LUKE.*

VIII. YOUR FATHER WHO IS IN HEAVEN.

WE return to the first Escape and to the *Teaching on the Hill*. Up there on the mountain top Jesus is alone with His chosen disciples enjoying a welcome season of recreation away from the sweltering heat and the crowds of the lake margin, and finding rest in a change of occupation. The Preacher and Healer now becomes the Teacher initiating His scholars into the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven. Heaven's peace reigns in the hearts of Master and scholars alike the while. It is for all a sacred, blessed holiday. The holiday mood is traceable throughout the recorded sayings of the Master during this season of repose; the tranquility of the uplands, the neighbourhood of the skies. In some parts of the discourse, especially, *e.g.*, the Beatitudes and

¹ Therefore it must suffice to remark that, if the facts which I have here referred to be properly weighed, they will be found, I believe, to support many of the *literary* conclusions which critics have reached respecting the different sources of which the Pentateuch is composed, and the dates to which they are to be referred.