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

## SINCE WELLHAUSEN.

### 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 criti-
cism" 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 inelas-
tic" (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 prob-
lem* 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 $1^1$–$2^3$, $10^1$–$17^{1s}$, $18^1$–$19^{28}$, 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 | | |
| $2^4$–$3^{24}$ | 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 ($20^{18}$, $21^{1, 1, 33}$, $22^{11, 14, 14, 15, 16}$) | | |
| 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. $5^7$, $6^{62t.}$ (=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. $3^{15}$ 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. 1¹–Ex. 6². If I may put the matter in a nutshell, (a) it found the original clue in Ex. 6²,³: " 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. 17¹ 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. 6²⁻¹². 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. 3¹³⁻¹⁵ 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. 1¹–Ex. 6² 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. 1¹– Ex. 3¹³ occupies 76 pages ; the rest of the Pentateuch

---

* Fuller reasons for this inference will be given at the beginning of the next article.

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. 17¹⁴, 24⁴, 34²⁷ ; Nu. 33² ; Deut. 31⁹⁻¹³, ²², ²⁴⁻²⁶. Genesis and Leviticus contain no allusions to the writing of them, and even Deuteronomy (1¹, ³, ⁵, 4⁴¹, ⁴⁴, 5¹) 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. 1¹, 4¹,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. 1¹ ' 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. 14[6], etc.), ark of God, etc.

III. Elohim in certain phrases.

E.g. 'So may God do to me and more also ' (1 Sa. 3[17], etc.) ; ' *as* the angel of God ' (1 Sa. 29[9] + 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 stereotyped 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.' Compare 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[33], 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[b] the writing, Deut. 21[23] the curse, 33[1] the man, of God. I have already discussed this type of expression in connexion with Baumgärtel'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 expressions, 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 trustworthiness 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.

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

### THE TEN BEST BOOKS ON PRAYER.

PRAYER is the most truly characteristic act of a religious man. It is the instinctive act of one who is aware of the personality and the nearness of God. There are great truths conditioning it, great problems connected with it, and great openings for progress in the art of it. Nevertheless, it does not in itself call for any use of books. "For praying," as William Law said, "is not speaking forth eloquently, but simply the true desire of the heart ; and the heart, simple and plain in all good desires, is in the truest state of preparation for all the gifts and graces of God. And this I must tell you, the most simple souls that have accustomed themselves to speak their own desires and wants to God in such short but true breathings of their heart to Him, will soon know more of prayer and the mysteries of it, than any persons who have only their knowledge from learning and learned books." As Schleiermacher said in one of his sermons : "To be religious and to pray are one and the same thing." What Sabatier put negatively—"Where there is no prayer, there is no religion," Deissmann puts positively, "Religion, wherever it is alive in man, is prayer."