

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 *Scripture* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_scripture-01.php

Jesus had made in the previous verse seems to indicate that the question is to be understood as a sincere one.

So from the nature of the questions asked, it remains possible that the author of the Fourth Gospel is following the Passover Haggadah arrangement.¹ This possibility is enhanced by the fact that vv. 31-58, which begin with the *haggadha* question concerning the interpretation of scripture, seems to be formally a midrash of Ps. 78:24, a text concerning a Passover theme important for a Jewish Christian Passover ritual modelled on the Jewish Passover Haggadah.²

EDWARD J. KILMARTIN, S.J.

Weston

REFLECTIONS ON THE SOURCES OF THE PENTATEUCH³

Permit me to introduce my subject by a fictional illustration. If it should happen that three thousand years hence archaeologists should endeavour to piece together the history of our times, what would they make of the discovery of a school library? If the first writing to be discovered was Shakespeare's *Othello*, or worse still More's *Utopia*, would it upset their theories about late medieval Europe? I should think that it would shatter a fair number of historical dogmas until they realised that they were dealing with dramatic fiction in the one case and fantasy in the other.

Something similar holds for biblical studies. It is impossible to begin the interpretation of a text until one has decided what type of literature it is, how it came to be written and how were the contemporary readers expected to understand it. Inspiration does not lift a writer out of space and time. God works through men as He finds them. Only when we have understood the intention of the writer can we appreciate the inspired message. For instance, if the ancient hagiographer intended the division of creation into six days

¹ Other possible points of contact between the Jewish Passover Haggadah and Jn. 6:26-58 are the use of the liturgical formula EGO EIMI and the parallel between Jn. 6:35 and the words of the Father when he raises the Seder dish at the beginning of the Passover meal. cf. B. Gärtner, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

² Concerning the probability of the existence of such a Christian Passover ritual and the further probability of a connection between Jn. 6 and such a ritual, see B. Gärtner, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-38. Lately, moreover, G. Ziener has argued convincingly that a Christian Passover Haggadah probably served as a basis of John's Gospel (cf. 'Johannes-evangelium und urchristliche Passafeier,' *Biblische Zeitschrift* II (1958), pp. 263-74.

³ The substance of a paper read to the Newman Association in February 1960

as a literary convention, then inspiration would not convert them into historical periods of twenty-four hours.

These considerations are of the utmost importance for the Pentateuchal books since their form and composition are more different from our modern literature than any other part of the Bible. I prefer to speak of the Pentateuchal books generically since it is more accurate to regard them as one book rather than five.

The five books now known as Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy form one literary unit. It could be called the Constitution of the ancient Jewish theocratic state, and Genesis is its preamble. The division into five books was occasioned by the desire to split it up into scrolls of manageable size. Differences of subject matter were one guide to this, but the separation, for example, between Genesis and Exodus is arbitrary, being no more than the transition from happiness to unhappiness in Egypt. The Pentateuch as a whole records the ancient history, the covenant and the laws of the Jewish Theocracy.

Genesis is the most basic of the five parts since it introduces us to Abraham, the father of the Israelites, and the first man to possess the monotheistic religion of the one true God. This is the primary focus of the book. Abraham's history is continued in the details of the life of his sons, grandsons and so on into the Book of Exodus where we read of the growth of the family into a nation, and of their liberation under Moses. This culminates in the Covenant on Sinai which constitutes them as a theocracy enjoying the special favour of God. For the sake of completeness, and because it was the custom of the ancient Orientals to start their histories with the making of the world, the period before Abraham is also catered for. An account is given of the events from the Creation up to the vocation of Abraham. The terms of the Sinai covenant are thus prefaced by a history from God's first making the world up to His contract with His people on Mount Sinai.

The name history signifies a fairly wide notion. Let it be said straight away that the Pentateuch, where it records history, records religious history. That is to say, events are selected because of their bearing on the religious, rather than the political, history of the people, and of the many significant aspects of one event the hagiographer will select only the religious one. For instance, much could have been said about the history of the Israelites in Egypt, but only those details have been preserved which are relevant to the religious life of the people. Does this destroy the notion of history and invalidate the claim of the Pentateuch to be an historical record? By no means. The Cambridge Modern History must not be taken as the exclusive archetype

excluding all other types of historical writing. The ancients particularly had a very elastic notion of history. Consider the Peloponnesian War of Thucydides. The ancients regarded it as a history; we would regard it more as a meditation on the philosophy of war, since he shows the changes which came about in the behaviour of the people as a result of the stress of war. Even in our own day, if my memory serves me rightly Sir James Jeans wrote a history of the solar system consisting for the most part of events which nobody had witnessed but which were known by conjecture. A book can qualify as history if it is an account of the past; a more rigorous definition would exclude from this category many ancient and modern histories.

Applying these ideas to Genesis, we can say that the section from Abraham onwards is religious history based on tradition, and the part before Abraham is based largely on conjecture.¹

The Book of Genesis contains many difficulties, but the understanding of them is in a large measure solved when one has appreciated the method by which the book was composed. For the moment let it be said that its composition is unlike anything known nowadays in the writing of history. Let me put before you two well-known extracts from Genesis. The first is the account of the creation at the very beginning of the book :

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters. And God said, 'Let there be light'; and there was light. And God saw that the light was good; and God separated the light from the darkness. God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. . . . Then God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.' So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. (Gen. 1:1-5, 26-27)

The second passage comes from the next chapter :

In the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, when no plant of the field was yet in the earth and no herb of the field had yet sprung up—for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was no man to till the ground; but a mist went up from the earth and watered the whole face of the ground—then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being. (Gen. 2:4-7)

Here we have in two successive chapters two different accounts of the same events. Is it likely that the author would have thus written the same thing twice? Or is it possible that he had two different accounts

¹ cf. Dubarle, *Le Péché originel dans l'Écriture*, Paris 1958, p. 49

in his source material and joined them together more or less as they stood? Let me present to you another illuminating passage :

And Noah did all that the Lord had commanded him. Noah was six hundred years old when the flood of waters came upon the earth. And Noah and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives with him went into the ark, to escape the waters of the flood. Of clean animals, and of animals that are not clean, and of birds, and of everything that creeps on the ground, two and two, male and female, went into the ark with Noah, as God had commanded Noah. And after seven days the waters of the flood came upon the earth. In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, on that day all the fountains of the great deep burst forth, and the windows of the heavens were opened. And rain fell upon the earth forty days and forty nights. On the very same day Noah and his sons, Shem and Ham and Japheth, and Noah's wife and the three wives of his sons with them entered the ark. (Gen. 7:5-13)

On reading this one is left with the inescapable impression that Noe has gone into the ark twice. Examples could be multiplied at length, but they serve only to confirm the suspicion that the last author of Genesis, and indeed of the whole Pentateuch, had at his disposal differing accounts of the same events. Being unable or unwilling to give preference to one, he embodied in his narratives the accounts of both his sources. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that different names are used for God. In one section there is the consistent use of Elohim, and in other sections we see the consistent employment of the name conventionally rendered Yahweh.

Observations such as these gave rise to the famous documentary theory which has dominated the critical study of the Pentateuch for more than two centuries. In its essence, the theory maintains that the Pentateuch (and indeed other parts of the Old Testament) was composed by utilising various sources. These sources were combined not by 'digestion' but by simple juxtaposition which left their own form and content intact.

After one or two tentative experiments, the first decisive study of this matter came from the pen of the Frenchman, Jean Astruc, physician to King Louis XV. In 1753 he published a book entitled *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paraît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse*. The very idea was so radical that it did not have a profound effect for about one hundred years. In the middle of the nineteenth century two German scholars, Hupfeld and, after him, Riehm, elaborated the hypothesis of the existence of four basic documents which were given the names which have persisted. They are the documents which use Elohim and Yahweh, designated as E and J, the Deuteronomial source designated as D and the Priestly law designated as P. The wide acceptance of this theory was due principally to the demonstration which it received in 1889 from the brilliant

German scholar Wellhausen, whose name has subsequently become associated with the theory, almost to the exclusion of all other scholars. Has there been any further elaboration of the theory? The principle of a plurality of sources is now almost universally accepted; concerning the exact number there is much dispute. Wellhausen himself admitted the existence of lesser sources in the four main documents. After him it became customary to identify two or three subdivisions in J, two in E, two others in D and several in P, i.e. a total of at least eight sources. In 1941 A. Lods stipulated the presence of three sources in J, four in E, six in D and nine in P. In other words a total of twenty sources, not to mention the editorial glosses of no less than eight redactors. As Père de Vaux declared,¹ it looked as if the documentary hypothesis was about to dissolve itself by the rigorous application of its own basic principles.

However, since 1945 a healthy reaction has set in, thanks to the Swedish school, of which the greatest name is that of Engnell, which gives great prominence to the unwritten traditions. Thus the Pentateuch is seen to be the compilation of four basic sources which are themselves the products of oral traditions. This is a very important modification of the original theory, and accounts for the lack of homogeneity in the documents, for whereas a written document is rather rigid, an oral source is sufficiently fluid to admit without much upheaval the introduction of new elements.

What is to be the attitude of a Catholic to this theory of the composition of the Pentateuch? To this question one can reply that generally it is accepted among Catholic biblical scholars. Allowing for certain reservations on the hypothetical character of much of it, and granting due place to the presence of the oral traditions, the theory of the four sources is accepted by all Catholic scholars of note.

Since the theory is so revolutionary it will perhaps be of interest here to indicate the general lines on which it is justified. In the first place, is such a method of composition possible, or likely, or even to be presumed in a book coming from an ancient oriental milieu? Of the various ancient eastern histories which have survived several show signs of having been composed in a manner closely resembling that which is suggested for the Pentateuch. For example, in 1921 Cardinal Tisserant published an analysis of the composition of a twelfth-century Syriac chronicle. The sources used by the chronicler for the first part of his history were the two Jewish apocryphal writings, the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Cave of Treasures*. The cardinal set down in parallel columns the texts of the chronicle, and the two sources. It was then possible to examine them closely, and it became apparent that the

¹ *La Genèse* (Bible de Jérusalem), Paris 1953, p. 11

chronicle itself had practically nothing which was original. Practically every word and phrase had been taken without alteration from one or other of the sources. These selections were not harmonised, but were placed end to end in a very detailed process of dovetailing.¹

A similar example also from Syria is that of Tatian's well-known *Diatessaron*. This document was composed in the second century. It is open to question whether it was originally written in Greek or Syriac. This detail is of little relevance for the present inquiry. The content of the document was a biography of Christ derived from the four gospels in which sections of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John are quoted so as to give a continuous narrative. Not one word of it was Tatian's own; he simply fitted together selected quotations from the four gospels. Admittedly a reverence for the inspired texts would have influenced him, but it is significant that no part of the Western church created any such document, and the *Diatessaron* was so popular in Syria that it was only with great difficulty that they were persuaded in the fifteenth century to use the four separate gospels in their liturgy.

Several similar documents have been discovered, emanating from various parts of the Near East, and their import is clear. It means that there is no *a priori* difficulty in admitting that the Pentateuch was composed by the relatively uncritical compilation of sources. One may perhaps go further, and say that such a method was even likely.

Having vindicated the possibility of the documentary hypothesis, let us proceed further and examine the more positive arguments which would seem to demand this method of composition. The repetitions, or doublets as they are called, have been alluded to already. Two accounts are given of the creation, the genealogy of Cain is described twice, the narrative of the Deluge is full of repetitions, and on two occasions Abraham seeks to save his life by saying that Sarah is his sister and not his wife. There are many others. The only really satisfactory explanation of these repetitions is that the last editor of Genesis found both accounts in two documents or sources which he regarded with equal respect. Being unable or unwilling to decide which was the more reliable account, he embodied both of them in his final narrative, using the very words and expressions which he found in his sources.

Differences of style and vocabulary are equally striking. The most obvious pointer here is the use of different names for God. Why should one section employ consistently Elohim, while the next section uses Yahweh with equal consistency, unless it is that the primitive sources employed throughout the one name or the other. There are many other pointers like this and the explanation of them is the same.

¹ cf. Chaine, *Le Livre de la Genèse*, Paris 1951, pp. 497ff.

Primitive sources which were consistent in style have been cut up piecemeal to be inserted into a longer narrative with the very minimum of editorial modification.

A glance at the history of the chosen people gives still stronger evidence that the Pentateuch is made up of successive compilations of diverse sources. Let us consider the unicity of sanctuary. The ritual prescriptions of the 14th chapter of Deuteronomy make it clear that the Jews were to have only one temple. It is difficult to reconcile this statement with other parts of the Pentateuch which seem to envisage many altars of sacrifice (e.g. Ex. 20:24). It would appear that the whole of the book of Deuteronomy was read out by Moses to the Israelites on the east bank of the Jordan prior to their invasion of Palestine. What then are we to make of it when we read that Samuel used to offer sacrifice at Maspha, Galgala and Bethlehem, and that he built an altar at Ramatha. Solomon offered sacrifice at Gabaon, and even after the building of the temple at Jerusalem the prophets Elias and Eliseus offered sacrifices elsewhere. Is it possible that all these good men were unaware of the law of the unique sanctuary? Or is it possible that the regulations restricting sacrifice to one place came into force later, but were inserted in the text of the Pentateuch, so as to be included with the other laws? Consider again the ranks within the priesthood. Chapters three, four and eight of the Book of Numbers envisage a clear distinction between the simple Levites (who are like sacristans) and the priests proper, who will offer the sacrifices. Deuteronomy seems to know of no such distinctions, and indeed in the rest of the Old Testament the first indication of the splitting of the priests into two classes is in Ezechiel (44:10-16). Ezechiel is to be assigned to the period of the exile, and even so the twofold division is envisaged as something for the future.

A final source of information is the comparison of the laws themselves. Among the various regulations which appear to have been given to Moses by God before the entry into the promised land, it is possible to find different regulations on the same matters. Take for example the question of slavery. Ex. 21:2-6 deals with the way in which a Hebrew slave is to be treated. Yet Lev. 25:39-46 forbids the Israelites to have slaves other than gentile ones. Similarly in the question of the tithes, Num. 18:21-4 commands the payment to the Levites of all tithes, yet in Deut. 14:22-9 the system is altogether different and a third-year tithe is to be given to them.

There is no need to pursue these examples any further. The most reasonable deduction from them is that the Pentateuch is composed of several sources whose materials were drawn from a wide range of different places and epochs.

This conclusion leads naturally to two further questions: what were these sources, and how can their existence be reconciled with the tradition that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch?

Let us take a look first of all at the source J. It begins with an account of the creation in the second chapter and ends, as far as Genesis is concerned, with the death of Joseph. It relates picturesque scenes such as the Garden of Eden and the sin of Adam and Eve, the origins of various inventions, such as the use of metals and musical instruments, the tower of Babel, envisaged as the origin of different languages, and Jacob's supplanting Esau by the trick of the goat skins. It supplies much information about the patriarchs and the career of Joseph in Egypt. There are some surprising omissions though. For instance in its present form J omits the deaths of Abraham and Sara, though undoubtedly it contained them in its primitive integral form prior to its absorption into Genesis as we know it.

The general tone of J is intensely religious and it notes carefully the most primitive religious worship, such as the sacrifice of Abel and the altars built by Abraham and Isaac. Apparently the author is not bashful about mentioning sacred trees and high places. The mention of God (under the name Yahweh) is anthropomorphic in the extreme. Yahweh accomplishes all manner of menial tasks such as fashioning man's body out of clay, and shutting the door of the Ark after Noe has gone in. He is also spoken of as having remarkably human emotions, such as regretting that He had ever created man. Finally J displays a marked preference for the nomadic life, in much the same way as we in our day prefer country to city.

The second source E begins in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis with the history of Abraham, and it is highly probable that it never had any earlier material. Its history of the patriarchs is very detailed, some of it being parallel to that supplied by J, as for instance the career of Joseph in Egypt, whereas a number of incidents are proper to it, notably the projected sacrifice of Isaac, and Esau's relinquishing of his birthright for a plate of lentils.

Compared with J it is more 'refined,' if one may use the word with reverence. The notion of God is more transcendent. Rarely is He spoken of performing anything humanwise, and when he communicates with men it is through the medium of visions and dreams. The moral tone is more exacting than Y, but like that source it has no scruple about describing the sacrifices offered by the patriarchs, or by their consecrating high places, sacred trees or sacred stones.

In the third place we come to consider the source P, which is, in a sense, the most important in Genesis. It begins with an account of the Creation (chapter 1), and in its primitive form probably divided

early history into a fourfold scheme. These were the epochs of the Creation, of Noe, of Abraham and of Moses. The final author of Genesis almost certainly used P as the plan and its general scheme has thus given our Pentateuch its overall pattern.¹ Rarely does this source give the wealth of detail such as is to be found in J and E ; rather it presents a sober systematisation of the whole narrative. Detailed chronological schemes abound, such as the six days of creation, together with long and complicated genealogies. The numbering of the years is complete, and it was upon the information supplied by the Priestly law that the Jews were able to establish a chronology which dated from the creation of the world.

If we describe E as being 'refined' in tone, P is 'orthodox.' Great care is taken to avoid all anthropomorphisms ; when God creates the world, He does so by a word of command. His communications with human beings are rare and mysterious. He is never spoken of as displaying human emotions such as anger. In this source God receives different appellations. His name is Elohim at the beginning. For the patriarchs he is El-Shaddai, and to Moses He makes known His name of Yahweh. There is no reference to high places, nor is it ever said that the patriarchs offered sacrifices. Only the sacrifices of the Mosaic law are regarded as legitimate.

The fourth element of the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy (D), is rather different from the others. It is almost exactly conterminous with the book of Deuteronomy which has close affinities with Josue, Judges and Kings. Its content is a restatement of the law of Moses, reduplicating much of what is to be found in Exodus and Leviticus, and it is permeated with a high appreciation of God's love for the Israelite nation.

These then are the sources of the Pentateuch, the first three of which (J, E and P) are to be found in Genesis. In assigning dates to them we must bear in mind something of the general historical situation. The united kingdom of Solomon split up into the northern and southern parts after his death. The northern kingdom was conquered by the Assyrians who destroyed Samaria its capital in 722 B.C., and the southern kingdom was in exile in Babylon from 589 to 538 B.C.

The most convenient starting-point for this process of dating is the Book of Deuteronomy, since this document, in its written form, is directly connected with the reform of Josias.² When relating the religious reform of the good king Josias, 2 Kg. 22 and 2 Chron. 34 describe how a book was discovered which was identified as the law of God, but which was unfamiliar to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The reform of Josias took place at the end of the seventh century B.C.,

¹ de Vaux, *op. cit.*, p. 16

² de Vaux, *op. cit.*, p. 18

and there can be little doubt that the book discovered was Deuteronomy, recently brought from Samaria by refugees from the defeated northern kingdom. Deuteronomy, then, existed in more or less its present written form from the end of the seventh century B.C.

The Priestly Law in its totality is later than D. It was elaborated in the Exile and enforced after the return of the Jews from captivity. The sources J and E are both earlier than D. J acquired its present written form possibly about the time of King Solomon, and E was a little later. This is the chronology which Père de Vaux suggested in 1953, and I was interested to see that in 1958 the German scholar Otto Eisfeldt was prepared to put the composition of J as far back as the time of King David.

Nowadays there is a fair measure of agreement on the milieux from which these sources emanated. You will have observed that we have virtually two histories (J and E) and two law systems (D and P). Furthermore, it is not unreasonable to associate their elaboration with the major shrines of the Israelites. Thus there can be little doubt that J took its origin in the southern kingdom of Juda, while it is generally held that E originated in the kingdom of the northern tribes. Deuteronomy seems to have been, at least for its essentials, the law code of the north, brought to Jerusalem after the destruction of Samaria, while the Priestly law is the work of the priests of Jerusalem.

We have now accounted for practically everything except Moses. What was his role in the composition of the Pentateuch? First of all it is clear that he did not write every word. It is inconceivable that one man should have written a work in four divergent styles. Yet if they did not come from one man, how are we to account for their fantastic resemblances? This problem is solved by the consideration of the oral traditions which came first, and which later gave birth to the four written sources. In the effort to demonstrate the existence of the separate sources emphasis has been placed on the divergences. In reality though, the similarities are far more striking. These four sources resemble each other so closely that it was possible to incorporate them more or less as they stood, into one narrative—the Pentateuch. Not only did they form one narrative, but for more than two thousand years this Pentateuch was considered to be the work of only one man. Such a situation cannot be explained without admitting some very early guide and source of unity from which the varying traditions could take their origin. The history of the Jewish nation has only one epoch which could have provided the necessary environment—the years of wandering in the desert.

The pilgrimage through the Sinai desert was the formative period in their history, when under the masterly leadership of Moses they

were welded into a nation, and received their law and covenant from God. In this way Moses became the creator of their nation, and the father of their social, historical and legal tradition. No-one else in their early history could have had the influence sufficient to impress the basic unity on the stream of tradition which later crystallised into the sources J, E, D and P.

This solution of the problem of Moses' role in the composition of the Pentateuch also makes sense of the enigmatic formula 'The Lord said to Moses.' This phrase occurs constantly in the Pentateuch at the beginning of new paragraphs of laws. It does not mean that Moses is the immediate author of the laws which follow.¹ It was the practice of ancient Oriental writers to opt for anonymity. If a later writer added to the work of an earlier one he would not display his own name. Thus it came about that all the Psalms were attributed to David. All the proverbs were attributed to Solomon. Similarly all the laws were attributed to Moses the giver of the first ones. The subsequent laws which emanated from this homogeneous tradition inspired by the same school of lawyers would naturally be attributed by the Israelites to Moses and introduced by the words 'Moses said,' or 'The Lord said to Moses.' This kind of convention is employed even in our own day. People are said to be detained in prison at 'her Majesty's pleasure.' It is a convention, and in all probability her Majesty does not know of the existence of the particular prisoners. In that part of the world from which I come, the county schools are supervised by the Director of Education of the West Sussex County Council. In current jargon this august person and his staff are known by the collective designation of 'Chichester.' One hears it said that 'Chichester is on the warpath,' or that 'Chichester has refused permission for the building of two more classrooms.' If we in our sophisticated civilisation employ such quaint conventions of speech, why should we hesitate to accord a similar liberty to the ancient Jews?

One final problem has to be dealt with in this question of the composition of the Pentateuch. Granted that Moses was the author of the basic Pentateuchal traditions, who was responsible for putting it in its present form? The answer to this is Esdras. In the year 444 Nehemias and the scribe Esdras inaugurated an important religious reform among the recently returned exiles. It was at this period that the Priestly law was enforced and it is highly probable, if not almost certain, that the Pentateuchal sources were assembled in their present form at that time. The Jewish and Christian tradition is almost as strong concerning the literary work of Esdras as it is in upholding the basic authorship of Moses. The Talmud and the apocryphal IVth

¹ Chaine, op. cit., p. 477

Book of Esdras have some extravagant stories about Esdras reconstructing the sacred books of the Law which had been lost in the Exile. The essence of this tradition is maintained, with more sobriety indeed, by a number of the fathers, namely Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Basil the Great, Jerome and Isidore of Seville. The latter said quite simply of Esdras, 'This man wrote the sacred history and after Moses he is the second author of the Law, for after the captivity of Babylon he rewrote the Law which had been destroyed by the gentiles.'¹ At the back of these rather extravagant statements it is not difficult to see the survival of a tradition that Esdras had some very important role in the composition of the Law. The most satisfactory account of it is to admit that whereas Moses was the progenitor of the Pentateuch, Esdras put it into the written form which it has today.

MICHAEL M. WINTER

QUESTION AND ANSWER

SIMON BARJONA

On one occasion St Peter is addressed as Simon Barjona (Mt. 16:17). Is Barjona simply a patronymic or is it a symbolical name, meaning 'son of the dove'?

UNDER Hellenistic influence it became customary for the Jews, especially those of the Diaspora, to adopt a Greek name, and during the Roman occupation of Palestine Latin names were occasionally used. There was a variety of names from which to choose, but preference was usually given to transliterations of their original names, or to names which were similar in sound to the Hebrew or Aramaic. Thus for instance there were high priests who changed their names from Josue to Jason and from Menelas to Onias. The Latin name Justus is found together with a Hebrew name on two occasions in the New Testament (Ac. 1:23; 18:7) and once alongside the Greek form Jesus (Col. 4:11).²

In the Gospels Greek names are rare, but we do find Nicodemus, Andrew and Philip, whilst Thomas has also the Greek name Didymus with the same meaning of 'twin' (Jn. 11:16; 20:24; 21:2).

The original name of St Peter was the Hebrew Simeon. In the

¹ Isidore of Seville, *De Ortu et Obitu Patrum*, PL LXXXIII, 146

² Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 315; *Dictionnaire de la Bible* IV, 1675