

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 Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH—RE-EXAMINED

SOME INTRODUCTORY CONSIDERATIONS

THE aim of this thesis is really to ask the question once again as to whether the statement of the critics is quite correct when they say "All critics are agreed on this or that point."

But before considering the critical and conservative position with reference to the Pentateuch, a few points need to be brought forward.

I. WHO ARE THE CRITICS ?

To a certain extent everyone who uses the faculty of passing judgment on any subject is a critic, and therefore those who hold to the conservative position are critics equally with those who contend for the "Modernist" position. But the aim in this thesis will be to take the statements of the so-called "Moderate Critics." This is done for a very special reason. It has been said frequently to the writer as follows: "I certainly could not accept the outrageous teaching of such men as Graf or Wellhausen, but I readily accept the moderate position of such men as Dr. Driver or Dr. G. B. Gray." Consequently the statements which will be made hereafter as to the critical position will be based on such writers as being representatives of the "Moderate School of Criticism."

On the other hand, many statements of the "Conservative Position" will be taken from such books as Dr. Orr's book, *The Problem of the Old Testament* and Dr. R. Dick Wilson's *Critical Investigation of the Old Testament*.

The reason for re-stating these things is that, though many books have been written since Dr. Orr's book first appeared, yet generally speaking, the various arguments there set forth have never yet been answered, in fact it would be more correct to say they have been totally ignored. Therefore the writer is very anxious to put the two positions side by side, and if the various arguments of the "Conservative Critics" can be assailed, by all means let them be answered; but if they are unassailable, then let the "Moderate Party" give up being dogmatic in their

assertions that "All critics are agreed on such a point," and thus stating that anyone who does not hold these theories is absolutely excommunicate from any intellectual circle.

II. THE BOOK ITSELF

This is the second consideration which needs to be brought forward. As we shall see presently, the critical position is that the Pentateuch is a compilation of different sources, edited and re-edited at different periods of history, and therefore if that is the case, it is very remarkable that all these various editors should have been able to produce such a wonderful plan and unity out of the writings, for no one will doubt that there is a very definite plan running right through the Old Testament, and this plan has its origin in the Pentateuch. This being so, it is wiser to read the books themselves first and see what impression they make on our minds, before we start to tear them into small sections.

If one looks at the *Koran*, for instance, we find that the 114 chapters or Suras are arranged without any definite sequence of ideas. They are merely a collection of materials loosely joined together. But when we come to consider the Old Testament, we find that there is a definite purpose running through it. As a matter of fact, the title "Old Testament" implies the "New Testament," and this is quite true, for the plan of the Old Testament is carried on in the New, and as it has been said, "What is latent in the Old Testament is patent in the New." The types and shadows of the Old Testament have their completion and substance in the New. But it is especially in connection with the History of Israel that the unity can best be traced. The book Genesis begins with the account of the Creation of the World and also of man. From this the narrative goes on to show man's fall, and the gradual development of evil till it culminates in the flood. A fresh start is made in the covenant with Noah, but again the godlessness becomes so great that God makes another start by selecting Abraham to be the "Father of the Nations." From this point God's selection gets narrower, for first there is the selection of Isaac rather than Ishmael. Then again there is the selection of Jacob rather than Esau. Yet again Joseph is chosen in preference to his brethren. The Mosaic period is linked on to the Patriarchal age, by the renewing of the promises made during the earlier

period. Israel, after passing through a variety of changes in its nomadic life, eventually reaches the Promised Land. Here, in spite of God's previous dealings with Israel, and His teaching as to a Theocracy, the people ask for a king, and we are brought on to Israel in the reigns of Saul and David. As, however, this subject only deals with the Pentateuch, there is no need to trace the history further. But enough has been said to show how this unity of purpose can be traced all through the Old Testament.

Now the question for us is this : If the Pentateuch is made up as the critics maintain, by various editors working over sources of different dates, and of incorporating bits from first one and then another into the whole, is it quite reasonable to expect that such a wonderful unity would be the outcome as is to be seen in the Old Testament ? Of course some may say that the unity is only there because the books are arranged in a certain order. If they are put into a different order, the unity at once disappears. To answer this, I will quote once again an illustration from Dr. Orr's book which appears to be very apt.

A child has a box of bricks which when put together produce a certain picture. You come along and say to the child, "You got that picture by arranging the bricks in a certain manner, but if you arrange them in another way your picture disappears." Now it is not unreasonable to imagine that if by one arrangement a picture is obtained, and by another no such picture can be produced, then most likely the arrangement which produced the picture was the intention of the manufacturer of the bricks.

To apply the moral of the story to Old Testament criticism if by one plan we get a definite purpose and by another no such unity can be got, then since God is not the God of confusion, but of order, it is most reasonable to say that the arrangement of the books which gives the picture or unity is most probably the one God intended when He inspired men to write down His words.

III. CHRIST'S ATTITUDE TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

It is customary on the basis of Philippians ii. 6, where we are told that our Lord "emptied Himself," to say that when our Lord took upon Him our human nature He laid aside certain divine attributes, especially omnipotence and omniscience. It is more particularly with the latter that we are now concerned, for according to the critical theory, when Christ was referring to

the Old Testament He used language suited to His own times. In other words, He did not discuss any critical interpretation as to the authorship of any special book, but just accepted certain current theories. But as formerly we allowed the Old Testament to speak for itself before we started to pull it to pieces, so now we will let Christ speak for Himself in this matter.

In St. John xvii. 7 and 8 we read these words: "Now they have known that all things whatsoever Thou hast given me are of Thee. For I have given them the words which Thou gavest me, and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send me."

Certain points seem to stand out here.

- (1) That our Lord realised that all that He received was from the Father.
- (2) That among the "all things" were included "the words" which our Lord spoke to His disciples.
- (3) That the disciples realised that our Lord spoke divine words with divine power and authority.

It seems probable, to say the very least, that if there was any occasion when our Lord was most likely to reveal the truth, it would be in His communion with His Heavenly Father, and this was such an occasion when He offered up His high-priestly prayer. In fact as these verses stand, and when it is remembered how the prayer goes on to speak not only of the disciples, but also of those who should believe through their ministry, it seems almost as if our Lord foresaw the quibbling that would follow concerning His teaching, and therefore here He not only speaks of "all things" but expressly mentions "words" as part of the "all things" which He has received from His Heavenly Father.

Again in St. John xii. 49 and 50 we find our Lord says, "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, He gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life everlasting: Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."

Here again evidently, our Lord tells us that He only spoke as the Father gave Him utterance. Moreover, the disciples accepted His statements without any doubt or reservation.

In view of all this, what is the bearing of these passages and other passages on the subject of Christ's attitude to the Old

Testament? Let us consider the answer from another point of view. I will quote from a recent article by Dr. Campbell Morgan:¹

“From Christ’s first recorded word through all His subsequent doing and teaching it is evident that He recognised the Divine authority of the Mosaic economy. . . . All He taught was new, but its freshness was that of interpretation of truth, and its redemption from the wrong which had been done to it by those who had never rightly understood it. Out of the thirty-nine books, He quoted in the course of His ministry from twenty-four in words actually recorded for us. Approximately there are to be found sixty-six quotations from, or allusions to, the Pentateuch, forty from Isaiah, thirty-six from the Psalms, and twenty-two from Daniel—yes, positively from Daniel! There is no escape from the conviction that Jesus treated the Old Testament as Divine, and therefore authoritative.”

Now this is the point which I desire to state out of all this: If the Lord in quoting from the Old Testament did so as God spoke to Him, then the words were not His, but the Father’s. Either then our Lord spoke the truth, in which case the words He used were from the Father, or else, and I say it with all reverence, He spoke what was not true when He said that He only spoke as the Father spoke to Him. If the latter is the case, we are at once face to face with a fallible Saviour who could make mistakes, and indeed tell a lie, and in addition to that, we have no guarantee that any words that He spoke were true. Such a Saviour would be useless to us, and it is only necessary to state the position to deny it at once. We are therefore forced back to the former conclusion, namely that all that Christ said was the truth. There is also very strong evidence to support this conclusion, that our Lord’s words were Divine and were recognised as such by those who heard them.

For example, in St. John vi. 63, 68 and 69, we find the Lord says, “The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.” Then St. Peter states later, “Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.”

To sum up this section, let me quote again from Dr. Morgan’s article. He says, “In this matter of Christ’s relation

¹ *Evangelical Christendom*, July-August, 1928.

towards the Old Testament, we are compelled to accept one of three conclusions :

- (1) Christ was ignorant.
- (2) He was infallible, but did not think it was important to change popular conceptions of the Divinity of the Old Testament.
- (3) He was infallible, and criticism is always wrong when its conclusions conflict with His attitudes."

As to the first, enough has been said above to show that if Christ was ignorant of certain matters in connection with the Old Testament, then obviously it was not true when He said that all that He spoke He received from the Father. Some try to avoid this conclusion by saying that He was fallible in some points and not in others. In that case, who is to be considered the authoritative judge to tell us which statements are correct and which are not? Perhaps the following illustration will show the absurdity of the position. A clergyman once said to the writer of this thesis, "If some parts of the Old Testament are not true, why do not the critics who know so much more about the Old Testament writings than Christ Himself cut out all those statements which are not true, and leave us with a Bible on which we can rely?" The answer was given by the questioner, "I presume the critics are not agreed among themselves as to what is true and what is false." How true is that answer we shall see when we come to the criticism itself.

As to the second objection, that He was infallible, but did not think it important to change the popular conceptions of the Divinity of the Old Testament, I will quote the answer that Dr. Morgan himself gives to it. He says, "I at once dismiss it as involving the view that He was content to allow men to remain in superstition which He could have dissipated by a word." This statement hardly needs to be added to, and yet in connection with this, is it not curious that, where necessary, Christ did not hesitate to alter existing theories and beliefs where they were wrong, and yet if the Old Testament was not written as He suggested, that He should have left these theories uncorrected, especially when they did not appear to be such vital points as the doctrines contained in the books. In other words, Christ altered doctrines contained in the books, though it meant a complete break with the teaching of his time, yet the lesser

matter concerning the authorship of the books He left, and allowed the people to believe in their own theories, though He knew that they, as well as the doctrines of the books, were not correct.

We are thus left to the third conclusion, namely that Christ is infallible, and that whenever criticism questions the accuracy of His attitude, it is wrong, whatever its conclusion may be.

In order to show the connection of all this section with the subject in hand, let us illustrate from one point only.

In St. Matthew viii. 4, when Christ healed the leper, He said to him, "Show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded for a testimony unto them." I have not been able to trace that the words "that Moses commanded" have been left out in any texts, and therefore we cannot treat them as an interpolation. That being the case we are compelled to say that Christ actually used the words. But now where do we find what the gift was that the leper was expected to offer? The details are given in Leviticus xiv. 3, 4 and 10. But the critics tell us that this particular part of Leviticus belongs to the Priests' code, and thus was not written till the time of the exile or even later. If that is the case, then obviously Moses could not have written it. If, on the other hand, the various arguments given above are sound, then it becomes a question of Christ or the critics. Christ speaking the Father's words said "Moses commanded." The critics speaking for themselves say that some unknown priests wrote it at a much later date. Obviously one is a false statement. For my part I will leave it to the reader to make his own decision as to who is correct.

IV. THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION

Here again is a consideration which we shall see later has a great deal to do with the question of Old Testament criticism, especially that of the Pentateuch. The "Modern Critics" maintain that the order of the grouping of the sources is J, E, D and P. What all these terms mean will be explained in due course, but for the present let it suffice that they are put in this order because in that way can be traced a development in religious teaching. The reason at the back of this, however, is because it is thought that religion is the history of man's rise in his relationship toward God. Now the question is, is this true to the facts of the case?

The general idea with regard to religion is that it started with Fetishism, then passed on to Animism (a belief in spirits), later tribal religion took the form of Polytheism (that is, the belief in the multiplicity of gods), then gradually the conception was purified into Henotheism (that is, the belief in one god as supreme in one country, whilst admitting that other gods might be supreme in other places) and finally the stage of Monotheism was reached when nations came to the belief (or, shall we rather say, will come to the belief, for at present there are only three religions which teach Monotheism, namely Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism, and when it is remembered that the second sprang out of the first, whilst the third was a corruption of the first two, it will be realised that Monotheistic religion owes its origin to the teaching of the Old Testament) that there was one God as supreme over the whole universe. According to this theory, we are told that at first Israel worshipped in the form of Animism when as a nation we are told that worship took place at sacred trees, wells, and stones, but later their religion became purified so that by the eighth century B.C. the prophets teach Monotheism for the first time. As a theory this all sounds very plausible, but do the facts suit the case?

There appear to be three ways by which a religion may arise. (1) By revelation. (2) By assimilation. (3) By evolution. The theory suggested above is classed under (3), and is general as a theory amongst critics at the present time.

Dr. Menzies says: "The theory that man was originally civilised and humane, and that it was by a fall, by a degeneration from the earliest condition that the state of savagery made its appearance, is now generally abandoned."¹

But though this statement is made, and though no proof of it is given, on the other hand, when speaking of the tribes that worship a supreme being, he says: "In most savage religions there is a principal deity to whom the other deities are subordinate,"² and in the list which follows it seems almost to suggest that the idea of a supreme being is universal.

The North American Indians worship the Great Spirit, the Heaven with its breath; Ukko, the great god of the Finns, is regarded as supreme; the Samoyedes worship one good spirit as supreme over all the nature gods.³

¹ *History of Religion*, p. 36.

² *Ibid*, p. 36.

³ *Ibid*, p. 37.

The code of Hammurabi at least suggests that Ilu was a supreme god. The oldest texts on Egyptian religion express a monotheistic belief, and Ra is regarded as a supreme deity.

Vedism certainly has many gods, and yet at the back of them all is one common name for the god, namely Deva.

China, as is well known, worships Shang Ti (or in the case of the people, Tien or Heaven) as the supreme deity.

From this it will be seen that in all parts of the world, and from every stage of civilisation, there appears to be a belief in one supreme god, and therefore, whilst Monotheism at least suits the facts of the case so far as they are known to us, on the other hand evolution has no such support, though the theory may sound feasible, and indeed would be very acceptable to humanity, for it tends to show that man, if left to himself, would gradually get better and better, and so such a theory would nullify the Biblical conception of sin.

As, therefore, we are not able to accept the theory of evolution, we have to account for Israel's religion either as due to the process of assimilation or else to revelation.

With regard to assimilation, the greatest parallels to Israel's religion are to be found in that of Babylon. Now assimilation can only be produced by a constant intermingling the one with the other. Thus assimilation of nations is due to intermarrying, and this in turn is due to the fact that there are certain foreigners living in the midst of the nation, and by the constant intermingling this process of assimilation takes place. Moreover, the period of intermingling must be of some considerable length. When we come to consider the Israelites, therefore, there are two occasions when this intermingling might well have taken place. One was at the beginning of their history, and the other was at the end of their history, at least so far as the Old Testament has recorded for us. We find that the Semites, from whom Abraham and his family descended, were living almost in the country of Babylonia (for Chaldæa was adjoining the country of Babylon) before the call of Abraham. Also we know that the Jews were carried captive to Babylon in 596 B.C. The modern theory to allow for the development in religion would demand that the assimilation should take place during the second of these periods when Babylon's religion was fully developed.

Against this, however, it must be stated that by the time of the exile the religion of Babylon had become so corrupt that the

prophets seek to warn Israel against having anything to do with such a religion. It is only necessary to read through Jeremiah li., especially verses 6 and 17-19, to see how the prophet describes the religion of Babylon of those days, and also of God's attitude toward such a nation as practises such a religion, to see how corrupt it was. Surely if the assimilation had taken place at this period some of the corruptions would have crept in, yet Israel's faith and religion, according to the critics, is purer at this time, and becomes Monotheistic in outlook.

If, on the other hand, the assimilation takes place during the earlier period, it means that Israel had its Monotheistic faith from Babylon (for no one will doubt in comparing the Babylonian stories with those of Genesis, for instance, that the conception of God is purer in the latter) even in the time of Abraham, if not earlier. Thus, in either case, the facts put the critics into a hopeless position. Either Israel's religion was pure at the beginning and even Monotheistic at that time, or else if religion is a development, then Israel's religion got purer in contact with the Babylonish religion, whilst the latter was actually becoming more corrupt, and it is contrary to nature to find that when two systems are set side by side and one gets worse, that the other gets better. If two boys at school become friends, and one is good and upright and the other has depraved tastes (sooner or later the friendship will cease, no doubt, but until the good boy discovers the character of the other) it will be found that the influence of the evil boy will be stronger than that of the good boy. This may sound rather pessimistic, as if evil is stronger than good; but that is not so: but it shows that man by nature will prefer to go downwards rather than upwards, or perhaps we had better say it is easier to go down than up.

We observe, then, that assimilation, like evolution, hardly accounts for the facts of Israel's religion. We are therefore compelled to accept the other theory, namely revelation. It is curious that whilst some of the critics tell us that religion is due to evolution, there are critics of equally good authority who maintain that religion is due to revelation, for it is hardly credible that those who have been invited to write any articles in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* would be selected unless the editor thought they were competent to deal with the subject. So I turn to the article on "Religion," and this is what I read as a definition of religion. "Religion is

the soul's response to the spiritual revelation by which it is illumined, kindled, and moved." This is, of course, exactly what the Bible teaches, but it was no good taking passages out of the Bible to prove the Bible true, as that would be to argue in a circle, but now having reached that conclusion from outside sources, we can turn to the Bible and see what it says.

In Romans i. 20 and following verses we read: "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse; because that when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise they became foolish, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things."

Here St. Paul gives us the true origin of religion. God gave a revelation of Himself to primitive man, but the ideal was too high for man to attain, or at least man thought so, and thus instead of trying to reach it, he made a lower standard for himself, namely an image, to represent his god.

We may conclude from this that religion is due to revelation, and the soul's response to the revelation has been a "Fall" downwards, rather than a "Growth" upwards.

V. THE CRITICAL POSITION RE-EXAMINED¹

In these next sections, it will be the aim of the writer to endeavour so far as is possible to gather together the various statements of the "Moderate Critics" on the Pentateuch, and then to examine them point by point. As the theories all hang

¹ EXPLANATION OF THE TERMS USED

J. A source, using "Jehovah" as the name for God. Supposed to have been written in 850 B.C. in Judah.

E. A source, using "Elohim" for the Divine name. Supposed to have been written in 750 B.C. in Ephraim.

J.E. A compilation of the two sources (given above) made about 700 B.C.

D. The book of Deuteronomy. Supposed to have been written just before 621 B.C.

P. The Priests' Code. Supposed to contain part of Genesis and Exodus, most of Leviticus and Numbers, and said to have been drawn up by the priests just after the Babylonish Exile. Possible date about 500 B.C.

H. The Law of Holiness. An earlier section of *P.* (contained in Leviticus, Chaps. xvii.-xxvi.) dealing with the subject of "Holiness." Supposed to be dated between Ezekiel (570 B.C.) and *P.* (500 B.C.). Hence about 530 B.C.

R. The Redactor. This is the editor who has re-edited all these sources, adding or omitting phrases, so as to bring the whole Pentateuch into one continuous section.

together it will necessarily follow that some things may have to be repeated, as they may occur in different parts of the scheme, but on the other hand, to omit the repetition would lead to such confusion in thought since the whole scheme stands or falls together, that it seems best to take the subject point by point as suggested above.

The first point which will be made is, that the Pentateuch is a compilation of various sources of different dates, known by the names of J (the Jehovist or Jahvist source), E (the Elohist source), D (the Deuteronomist source), P (the Priests' Code) and H (the Law of Holiness), and that all these sources have been worked over and re-edited by a Redactor or Redactors, known by the letter R.

"As a result of investigation it has been found that the Pentateuch can be analysed into three great masses of matter easily distinguishable from one another in style: one style is found to separate off nearly the whole of Deuteronomy from the rest of the Pentateuch; it pervades practically the whole of that book except the poem in ch. xxxiii., a few verses in ch. xxxi. (14f; 23) and most of ch. xxxiv., but appears at most very sporadically elsewhere in the Pentateuch. Another style marks off most of the concluding parts of Exodus (chs. xxv.-xxxi., xxxiv. 29-xl. 38), the whole of Leviticus, Numbers i-x. 28, and considerable parts of Genesis (including i. 1-11, 4a), of the first half of Exodus, and of the remainder of Numbers. Easily distinguishable in style from either of the foregoing, and at the same time in some measure bound together by common qualities, is practically all that remains of the Pentateuch. On the other hand, along with common features, there are also some differences in this remainder. For these three main elements in the Pentateuch, or for the writers severally responsible for them, it is now usual to use the symbols D, P, JE, viz. D for all (save the slight exceptions indicated) of Deuteronomy, P for Leviticus and all thereto related, JE for the remainder, the two elements in which remainder are indicated by J and E."

"The process by which probably the Book of Genesis assumed its present form may be represented approximately as follows. First the two independent, but parallel, narratives of the patriarchal age, J and E, were combined into a whole by a compiler whose method of work, sometimes incorporating long sections

¹ Gray's *Critical Introduction to Old Testament* (known hereafter as G.O.T.), p. 26.

of each intact (or nearly so), sometimes fusing the parallel accounts into a single narrative, has been sufficiently illustrated. The whole thus formed (JE) was afterwards combined with the narrative of P by a second compiler who, adopting P as his framework, accommodated JE to it, omitting in either what was necessary in order to avoid needless repetition, and making such slight redactional adjustments as the unity of his work required."¹

"The structure of the Book of Exodus is essentially similar to that of Genesis, the same sources, P and JE, appearing still side by side, and exhibiting the same distinctive peculiarities."²

"The Book of Leviticus forms throughout part of the Priests' Code, in which, however, chs. xvii-xxvi constitute a section marked by certain special features of its own, and standing apart from the rest of the book."³

"In structure the Book of Numbers resembles Exodus, JE reappearing by the side of P, though as a rule not being so closely interwoven with it."⁴

"The structure of Deuteronomy is relatively simple. The main part of the book is pervaded throughout by a single purpose, and bears the marks of being the work of a single writer who has taken as the basis of his discourses, partly the narrative and laws of JE as they exist in the previous books of the Pentateuch, partly laws derived from other sources. Towards the end of the book either the same author, or a writer imbued with the same spirit, has incorporated extracts from JE and other sources, recording incidents connected with the death of Moses. One of the final redactors of the Pentateuch has brought the whole thus constituted into relation with the literary framework of the Hexateuch, by the addition of excerpts from P."⁵

These long sections extracted from the "Moderate Critics" own writings show very clearly that this theory after all is not so very different from that of Graf and Welhausen. But now, before dealing with these points of criticism, it may be helpful to see how the critics arrived at this theory. Jean Astruc wrote a book in 1753 in which he showed that there were two strata to be seen in the Book of Genesis, and each of these parts was peculiar in that it used a special name for God: one using Jehovah, and hence known as the "J" source, and the other using Elohim, and hence known as the "E" source.

¹ Driver's *Introduction to Literature of Old Testament* (known hereafter as L.O.T.), p. 20.

² *Ibid.*, p. 22.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

After that, however, these two sources were subjected to a more critical investigation, and it was discovered that J and E were really fitted into a framework. This was later known as P (the Priestly Code) because it was supposed that it had been compiled by the Priestly class during, or even after, the exile. (This point will be discussed in detail later on.) Then when Deuteronomy was brought into the range of criticism, it was felt that whilst D was dependent on JE, and was an expansion of the laws contained therein, on the other hand it appeared to be separate from P. It was still further noted that in the middle of P there was a section with a style entirely its own, and as the keyword was "Holiness" the source was known as H. Finally there were phrases added here and there to connect up the various sources, and these were assigned to a Redactor (R) or general editor.

VI

The next problem for us is to set out as far as possible a detailed account of the different parts of the Pentateuch which are ascribed to the various sources.

As the *P source* is the most involved, we give that first.

In Genesis i. 1-11, 4a; v. 1-28, 30-32; vi. 9-22; vii. 6, 11, 13-16a, 17a (except "forty days"), 18-21, 24; viii. 1-2a, 3b-5, 13a, 14-19; ix. 1-17, 28, 29; x. 1-7, 20, 22f, 31f; xi. 10-27, 31-32; xii. 4b, 5; xiii. 6, 11b-12a; xvi. 1a, 3, 15, 16; xvii.; xix. 29; xxi. 1b, 2b-5; xxiii.; xxv. 5-11a, 12-17, 19-20, 26b; xxvi. 34-35; xxvii. 46-xxviii. 9; xxix. 24, 29; xxx. 1a, 4a, 9b, 22a; xxxi. 18b; xxxiii. 18a; xxxiv. 1-2a, 4, 6, 8-10, 13-18, 20-24, 25 (partly), 27-29; xxxv. 9-13, 15, 22b-29; xxxvi. (in the main); xxxvii. 1, 2a; xli. 46; xlvi. 6-27; xlvii. 5-6a (lxx.), 7-11, 27b-28; xlviii. 3-6, 7(?); xlix. 1a, 28b-33; l. 12-13.

Exodus i. 1-5, 7, 13, 14; ii. 23b-25; vi. 2-vii. 13, 19, 20a; vii. 21b-22; viii. 5-7, 15b-19; ix. 8-12; xi. 9, 10; xii. 1-20, 28, 37a, 40, 41, 43-51; xiii. 1, 2, 20; xiv. 1-4, 8, 9, 15-18, 21a, 21c-23, 26, 27a, 28a, 29; xvi. 1-3, 6-24, 31-36; xvii. 1a; xix. 1-2a; xxiv. 15-18a; xxv. 1-xxx. 18a; xxxiv. 29-35; xxxv.-xl.

Leviticus i-xvi. and xxvii. (chs. xvii.-xxvi. are the section known as H).

Numbers i. 1-x. 28, 34; xiii. 1-17a, 21, 25, 26 (to Paran), 32a; xiv. (1, 2), 5-7, 10, 26-30, 34-38; xv.; xvi. 1a, 2b-7a (7b-11) (16, 17), 18-24, 27a, 32b, 35 (36-40), 41-50; xvii. 1-xx. 1a (to

month), 2, 3b-4, 6-13, 22-29; xxi. 4a (to Hor), 10, 11; xxii., 1; xxv. 6-18; xxvi.-xxxi.; xxxii. 18, 19, 28-32 (with traces in xxxiii. 1-17, 20-27); xxxiii.-xxxvi.

Deuteronomy i. 3; xxxii. 48-52; xxxiv. 1a (in the main), 5b, 7a, 8, 9.

It will be easiest to take *the part assigned to D* next, so as to shorten the list, for if we take P and D out of the Pentateuch we shall see that all that remains is to be given to J or E or JE.

Deuteronomy. Practically the whole of this book is assigned to D, save the poem in ch. xxxiii, xxvii. 5-7a; xxxi. 14, 15, 23; xxxiv. 1-5a, 6, 10.

The first thought that strikes the reader of this list for the first time as he looks through it is that it must have taken the critics a great deal of time to be able to analyse the books up so minutely as to be able to go into details of even half-verses. Then the next thought is, is it possible that all the critics working on their own initiative are able to produce similar lists? When we seek to know how far there is a unity of agreement between the critics we read, "In Genesis as regards the limits of P, there is practically no difference of opinion among the critics."¹ The word "practically," however, at once casts doubts and raises misgivings in one's mind, because we use the word to imply that there may be variations. So we only accept the analysis of P with hesitation. We next pass on to see what can be gathered about the JE section. This is what we read. "In the details of the analysis of JE there is sometimes uncertainty owing to the criteria being indecisive, and capable consequently of divergent interpretation."²

When we turn to Exodus, we do not meet with much better proof to strengthen our faith in this splitting up into minute particles of the whole of the Pentateuch. Thus as regards the analysis of JE in Exodus iii-xi, it is stated, "The analysis given above differs in some details from that given in previous editions."³ Here our faith receives a terrible shock, for we find that one of the critics tells us that he has altered his division since he last wrote, and therefore it comes to this: that what originally belonged to P may now possibly belong to JE. If that is the plan which the critics adopt, what guarantee have we that there may not be further divisions of the text in due course, and thus in future editions, we may find that what was once assigned to P, and

¹ L.O.T., p. 11.

² *Ibid.*, p. 14.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

is now given to JE, may in the next editions be given to D, and so forth? In other words, there is no suggestion of definiteness about the matter at all. Consequently, if the critics are not agreed amongst themselves as to what parts of the Pentateuch are to be given to different sources, there seems no reason why the conservative students should be asked to give up their view as to the unity of the books, for a theory which apparently has no foundation. Yet again we are brought back to our original question, namely, is it true when the critics say that "All critics are agreed on this point"? We can answer at any rate as regards the analysis of the Pentateuch, that they certainly are not agreed. But now, for the sake of argument, it will be necessary before proceeding further with the criticism to see how the division works out, supposing for the moment that all the critics are agreed on the lists quoted above.

It will be apparent at once that it is quite impossible to take all the different stories in the Pentateuch, and analyse them separately, but a few examples may be cited. We are going to presume that each of the sources had a separate origin, and thus we are going to see what sort of story each would tell if given by itself. It is the various divisions into half-verses, or minute omissions which arouse the greatest suspicion, and so we will take our examples from some of these.

In Genesis v. we discover by reference to the list given above that all the chapter except verse 29 is given to P, and when we look up the verse we read, "And he called his name Noah, saying, This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which the Lord hath cursed." Evidently the reason why the critics have assigned this verse to JE is because they say that JE is the only source which gives the account of the Fall and of the reason why the ground was cursed by God. So far, so good, but now when we turn to ch. vi. 11 and 12 (P) we read, "The earth was corrupt also before God, and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and behold it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth."

Now if P knows nothing of the Fall, then how is it that P is able to describe the way in which man had corrupted his way upon the earth? for the last section of P was in ch. i., where we are given the account of the Creation, and there we are told expressly that God saw all that He had made, and it was all

very good. Moreover, in ch. v. 28 (P) we read that "Lamech begat a son" and in verse 30 we read that his name was Noah. Also P continues to use this name throughout the story in chs. vi. and vii. But it is in verse 29 (JE) that we are given the origin of the name. We are thus forced to this conclusion therefore: either P is dependent on JE, which means that these different sources cannot stand alone but are one whole unity (which is the conservative position) or else P knew the name of Lamech's son but chose to borrow the information from JE, and if the latter is the case, is it reasonable to imagine that P would just go to JE for the one verse in the account when it could have been given out of its own source?

Let us consider another example. In Genesis xii. 6, according to JE we are told that "Abram passed through the land unto the place of Sichem," but we naturally ask what land, and we find the answer in verse 5, which says that "They went forth into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came." But we are indebted to P for verse 5, and therefore here again we are afforded a proof to show that JE cannot stand apart from P, and hence both sources are to be regarded as one continuous whole, for as before it seems unreasonable to believe that one source would state that Abram went into a certain land, and yet never say what that land was, and so make it necessary for a later editor to have to resort to another source to find out the name of the land.

In order not to confine ourselves in our examination of such passages to Genesis, we will take for our next example one of the sections in Exodus. According to the previous list we find that Exodus xvi. 1-3 and 6-24 are assigned to P, whilst verses 4 and 5 are given to JE. Now we examine the text, and we discover that it is the story of God providing food for the Children of Israel in the Wilderness. We also discover that the two verses assigned to JE tell us that only a certain portion was to be gathered every day. Then we look further into the story and we observe in verse 22 that it says, "That on the sixth day, they gathered twice as much bread." But this verse belongs to P. How then did the people of Israel know that on the sixth day they were to gather twice as much as on any other day? Only by observing the command given in another source. Again, we ask, is it likely that the reason for gathering twice the amount on the sixth day would be lacking from one source, yet we learn that they carried

out the rule given them in some other place? We are therefore compelled once again to the same conclusion: either that P contained the details of the command as well as JE, in which case it was unnecessary for P to borrow from JE, or else that they are really not two sources, but that the whole of the Pentateuch is one.

Many other instances might be given to illustrate the dependence of the one source on the other, but as there are many other points which remain to be considered, and as the reader can sort the material given above and satisfy himself on the subject, we will pass on to the next main point of criticism.

ALEC. L. LUMB.

Burslem Rectory.

(To be continued.)