

# ANTI-HIGHER CRITICISM

OR

TESTIMONY TO THE INFALLIBILITY

OF

## THE BIBLE

BY

PROFESSOR HOWARD OSGOOD, D.D., LL.D.

PRESIDENT W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM G. MOOREHEAD, D.D.

TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D., LL.D.

JAMES H. BROOKES, D.D.

GEORGE S. BISHOP, D.D.

B. B. TYLER, D.D.

PROFESSOR ERNST F. STROETER, Ph.D.

PROFESSOR JAMES M. STIFLER, D.D.

WILLIAM DINWIDDIE, D.D.

EDITED AND COMPILED BY

REV. L. W. MUNHALL, M.A.

*Author of "Furnishing for Workers," "The Lord's Return and Kindred Truth,"  
"The Highest Critics vs. The Higher Critics," etc.*



NEW YORK: HUNT & EATON  
CINCINNATI: CRANSTON & CURTS

1894

Copyright, 1893, by  
**HUNT & EATON,**  
NEW YORK.

Composition, electrotyping, printing, and binding by  
**HUNT & EATON,**  
150 Fifth Avenue, New York.

## THE UNITY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

BY W. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.,  
*Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary.*

THE various objections which have been urged against the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch resolve themselves into two classes, respectively affecting its form or its contents. In regard to the former it is affirmed that such is the constitution of the Pentateuch as to evince that it is not the continuous composition of any one writer, but that it is compacted of parts of diverse origin, the products of different writers, themselves long posterior to the Mosaic age; and consequently the Pentateuch, though it may contain some Mosaic elements, cannot in its present form have proceeded from Moses, but must belong to a much later period. In regard to the latter it is asserted that the Pentateuch contains so many anachronisms, contradictions, and inaccuracies that it cannot possibly have been written by Moses. The first class of objections is directed against the unity of the Pentateuch, the second against its authenticity.

In order to render intelligible the nature of the partition hypotheses, with which we shall have to deal, the nomenclature which they employ, and their application to the Pentateuch, it will be necessary first to state precisely what is meant by the unity for which we contend and then say a few words about the origin and history of those hypotheses by which it has been impugned, and the several forms which they have successively assumed.

By the unity of the Pentateuch is meant that it is, in

its present form, one continuous work, the product of a single writer. This is not opposed to the idea of his having before him written sources in any number or variety from which he may have drawn his materials, provided the composition was his own. It is of no consequence, so far as our present inquiry is concerned, whether the facts related were learned from preexisting writings, or from credible tradition, or from his own personal knowledge, or from immediate divine revelation. From whatever source the materials may have been gathered, if all has been cast into the mold of the writer's own thoughts, presented from his point of view, and arranged upon a plan and method of his own, the work possesses the unity which we maintain. Thus Bancroft's *History of the United States* rests upon a multitude of authorities which its author consulted in the course of its preparation; the facts which it records were drawn from a great variety of preexisting written sources; and yet as we possess it it is the product of one writer, who first made himself thoroughly acquainted with his subject and then elaborated it in his own language and according to his own preconceived plan. It would have been very different if his care had simply been to weave together his authority in the form of a continuous narrative, retaining in all cases their exact language, but incorporating one into another or supplementing one by another so as to string the several sources together in the form of a continuous narrative. In this case it would not have been Bancroft's History. He would have been merely the compiler of a work consisting of a series of extracts from various authors. Such a narrative has been made by harmonists of the gospel history. They have framed an account of all the recorded facts by piecing together extracts from the several gospels arranged in what is conceived to be their true

chronological order. And the result is not a new gospel history based upon the several gospels, nor is it the original gospel either of Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John; but it is a compound of the whole of them, and it can be taken apart paragraph by paragraph, or sentence by sentence, and each portion assigned to the particular gospel from which it was drawn.

Now the question respecting the unity of the Pentateuch is whether it is a continuous production from a single pen, whatever may have been the sources from which the materials were taken, or whether it is a composite production, made up from various writings woven together, the several portions of which are still capable of being distinguished, separated, and assigned to their respective originals.

The not improbable conjecture was expressed at an early period that there were ante-Mosaic records to which Moses had access, and of which he made use in preparing the Book of Genesis. The history of such a remote antiquity would seem to be better accredited if it had a written basis to rest upon than if it had been drawn solely from oral tradition. Thus the eminent orthodox theologian and commentator, Vitringa, expressed the opinion in 1707, in the interest of the credibility of Genesis, that Moses collected, digested, embellished, and supplemented the records left by the fathers and preserved among the Israelites. The peculiarity of the critical hypothesis, with which we are now concerned, however, is the contention that Genesis was not merely based upon preexisting writings, but that it was framed out of those writings which were incorporated in it and simply pieced together so that each section and paragraph and sentence preserved still its original style and texture, indicative of the source from which it came; and that by means of these criteria the Book of Genesis

can be taken apart and its original sources reproduced. The first suggestion of this possibility and the first attempt actually to realize it by decomposing the book into the prior documents which had been embedded in it, was made in 1753 by Astruc, a French physician of considerable learning but of profligate life, in a treatise entitled *Conjectures Concerning the Original Memoranda which, it appears, Moses used to Compose the Book of Genesis*. This hypothesis was adopted and elaborated with great learning and ingenuity by Eichhorn, the distinguished professor of oriental literature at Göttingen, to whose skillful advocacy it owed much of its sudden popularity.

1. The primary basis of this extraordinary hypothesis was found in the remarkable manner in which the divine names Elohim (the Hebrew term for God) and Jehovah are used, particularly in the earlier portions of Genesis, whole paragraphs and even long sections making almost exclusive use of one of these names, while the alternate sections make a similarly exclusive use of the other. Thus, in Gen. i, 1-ii, 3, Elohim occurs in almost every verse, but no other name of God than this. But in ii, 4-iii, 24, God is with few exceptions called Jehovah Elohim, and in chapter iv Jehovah. Then in chapter v we find Elohim again; in vi, 1-8, Jehovah, and in the rest of chapter vi Elohim, and so on. This singular alternation was remarked upon by some of the early Christian fathers, who offered an explanation founded upon the Greek and Latin equivalents of these names, but which is not applicable to the Hebrew terms themselves. Astruc's assumption was that it was due to the peculiar style of different writers, one of whom was in the habit of using Elohim, and another in the habit of using Jehovah when speaking of God. All those paragraphs and sections, which exclusively or predominantly employ the name

Elohim, were accordingly attributed to a writer denominated from this circumstance the Elohist; and when these paragraphs were singled out and put together they constituted what was called the Elohist document. The other writer was known as the Jehovist, and the sections attributed to him made up the Jehovist document. It was accordingly held that Genesis consisted of sections taken alternately from two distinct documents by authors of known proclivities, so far, at least, as their preference for or exclusive use of one or other of the divine names is concerned, and which existed and circulated in their separate state until they were combined as they are at present. This hypothesis is hence known as the documentary hypothesis, since it assumes as the sources of Genesis distinct and continuous documents, which are still traceable in the book from the beginning to the end. And the first argument adduced in its support, as already stated, is the interchange of divine names, each of which is erected into the criterion of a separate document.

2. A second argument was drawn from the alleged fact that when the Elohim sections are sundered out and put together they form a regularly constructed and continuous narrative without any apparent breaks or chasms, whence it is inferred that they originally constituted one document distinct from the intercalated Jehovah sections. The same thing was affirmed, though with more hesitation and less appearance of plausibility of the Jehovah sections likewise; when these are singled out and severed from the passages containing the name Elohim they form a tolerably well connected document likewise.

3. A third argument was drawn from parallel passages in the two documents. The same event, it is alleged, is in repeated instances found twice narrated in successive sections of Genesis, once in an Elohist section,

and again with some modifications or variations in a Jehovah section. This is regarded as proof positive that Genesis is not one continuous narrative, but that it is made up from two different histories. The compiler, instead of framing a new narrative, which should comprehend all the particulars stated in both accounts, or blending the two accounts by incorporating sentences from one in the body of the other, has preserved both entire, each in its integrity and in its own proper form, by first giving the account of the matter as it was to be found in one document, and subsequently inserting the account found in the other. Thus Gen. i, 1-ii, 3, contains the account of the creation as given by the Elohist; but although this states how the world was made, and plants and animals and men were formed upon it, the Jehovahist section, ii, 4, etc., introduces a fresh account of the making of the man and the woman, the production of trees from the ground, and the formation of the inferior animals. This repetition betrays, it is said, that we here have before us not one account of the creation by a single writer, but two separate accounts by different writers. So in the narrative of the flood: there is first an account by the Jehovahists, vi, 1-8, of the wickedness of man and of Jehovah's purpose to destroy the earth; then follows vi, 9-22, the Elohist's statement of the wickedness of man and God's purpose to destroy the earth, together with God's command to Noah to build the ark and go into it with his family and take some of all living animals into it; in vii, 1-5, the Jehovahist tells that Jehovah commanded Noah to go with his family into the ark, and to take every variety of animals with him.

4. A fourth argument is drawn from the diversity of style, diction, ideas, and aim which characterize these two documents. It is alleged that when these component parts of Genesis are separated and examined apart



each will be found to be characterized by all the marks which indicate diversity of origin and authorship. It is confidently affirmed that wherever the Elohim sections occur throughout Genesis they have certain peculiarities of diction and style which clearly distinguish them from the Jehovah sections; and these again have their own distinctive characteristics. The preference for one divine name above another, which has already been spoken of as a criterion, does not stand alone. There are, besides, numerous words and phrases that are currently used by the Elohist which the Jehovist never employs, and *vice versa*. Thus, the Elohist, in chapter i, uses the phrase "beast of the earth," and speaks of the earth bringing forth plants, while the Jehovist, in chapter ii, says "beast of the field" and "plant of the field." The Elohist, in chapter i, repeatedly uses the word "create;" he speaks of God creating the heavens and the earth, creating the whales and creating man. The Elohist, chapter i, speaks of man as male and female; the Jehovist, chapter ii, says instead, the man and his wife. The style of the two writers is equally marked: that of the Elohist is formal, verbose, and repetitious; that of the Jehovist is easy and flowing. In chapter i the same stereotyped phrases recur again and again, and particulars are enumerated instead of including all under a general term. Thus, verse 25, "God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind;" and verse 27, "God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." The Elohist gives God's command to Noah in detail (vi, 18), "Thou shalt come into the ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee;" the Jehovist simply says (vii, 1), "Come thou and all thy house into the ark."

Along with these peculiarities of diction and style, and corroborating the conclusion drawn from them, is the diversity in the ideas and scope of the two writers. Thus the Jehovist makes frequent mention of altars and sacrifices in the pre-Mosaic period; the Elohist is silent respecting them until their establishment at Sinai. It is the Jehovist who records the primeval sacrifice of Cain and Abel, of which the Elohist says nothing. The Elohist speaks in chapter v of Enoch walking with God, and (vi, 9) of Noah walking with God; but, though he gives (chap. ix) a detailed account of God's blessing Noah and his covenant with him after he came out of the ark, he says nothing of Noah's sacrifice, which the Jehovist records (viii, 20, etc.). The divine direction to Noah to take animals into the ark is given by the Elohist only in general terms. God bade him to take two of every sort (vi, 19, etc.). But the Jehovist informs us more minutely of the distinction of clean and unclean animals which then existed, and that Jehovah bade Noah take two of each species of the latter, but seven of the former.

These arguments, derived from the alternate use of the divine names, from the alleged continuity of each document taken separately, from parallel passages, and from the characteristic differences of the two writers, appear to lend so much plausibility to the documentary hypothesis that it speedily rose to great celebrity, and was very widely adopted; and many able and distinguished critics became its advocates. As at first propounded it did not conflict with the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Its earliest defenders, so far from impugning the authorship of Moses, were strenuous in maintaining it. So long as the hypothesis was confined to Genesis, to which it was at first applied, there was no difficulty in assuming that Moses may have incorporated in his history of

that early period these preexisting documents in any way consistent with his truth and inspiration.

It was not long, however, before it was discovered that the hypothesis was capable of being applied, likewise, to the remaining books of the Pentateuch. This extension of the hypothesis brought it for the first time in collision with the traditional belief of the Mosaic authorship; and this, with its various modifications, has since been one of the favorite and principal weapons of those who deny that it was written by Moses. If the entire Pentateuch is a compilation from preexisting documents, it was plausibly inferred that it must be post-Mosaic. For the documents themselves, inasmuch as they contained the record of Moses's own times, could not have been older than the Mosaic age. And if the Pentateuch was subsequent to them and framed out of them, it seemed natural to refer it to a still later period, though it should be observed that this by no means necessarily follows. Even if the composite character of the Pentateuch could be established on purely literary grounds, we might still suppose that the memoranda from which it was prepared were drawn up under Moses's direction and with his approval, and were either put together in their present form by himself, or, at least, that the completed work passed under his eye and received his sanction. So that it would still be possible to vindicate its Mosaic origin and authority, unless, indeed, the primary documents themselves are assigned to a later time than that of Moses.

This the critics, who have held this hypothesis, commonly do; and hence they claim that it affords ocular demonstration that the books traditionally ascribed to Moses are not his. And to corroborate this conclusion they appealed to Exod. vi, 3, where God says to Moses, "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob,

as God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH I was not known to them." They understood this to be a distinct declaration that the name of Jehovah was unknown to the patriarchs, being of later date than the time in which they lived, and that it first came into use in the days of Moses. It hence followed as a logical necessity that the Jehovist document, according to the testimony of this passage, was certainly not prior to the time of Moses; for it employs a name which had no existence previously. And it was plausibly urged that this document was probably post-Mosaic, for it is chargeable with the anachronism of putting into the mouths of the patriarchs the name of Jehovah, which did not then exist. This was thought to be contradictory to the Elohist statement above cited, and to betray a writer belonging to a period when the name of Jehovah had become so familiar and so universal that its recent origin was forgotten, and he unconsciously transfers to patriarchal times a designation current in his own.

This anachronism of the Jehovist led to the suspicion of others; and since, as has already been stated, it is this document which makes mention of patriarchal altars and sacrifices, which are never referred to by the Elohist, it was suspected that here again he had improperly transferred to the patriarchal age the usages of his own time, while the Elohist gave a more accurate representation of that early period as it really was. This was esteemed, if not a contradiction, yet a contrariety between the two accounts, a diversity in the mode of conceiving the period whose history they are recording, which reflects the different personality of the two writers, the views which they entertained, and the influences under which they had been trained.

These diversities between the Jehovist and the Elohist took on more and more the character of contradictions

as the credit of the Jehovist for veracity and accuracy was held in less and less esteem. Every superficial difficulty was made the pretext for fresh charges of anachronisms, inaccuracies, and contradictions. The text was tortured to bring forth difficulties where none appeared. An especially fruitful source was found in alleged parallel passages in the two documents. These were greatly multiplied by pressing into the service narrations of matters quite distinct, but which bore a general resemblance to each other. The points of resemblance were paraded in proof that the matters referred to were identical; and then every diversity in the two accounts was pointed out as so many contradictions between them, which betrayed the legendary and unreliable character of one or both the narratives. Thus because some of the descendants of Cain, whose genealogy is recorded by the Jehovist (Gen. iv, 17-22), bear the same or similar names as the descendants of Seth recorded by the Elohist (chapter v), Enoch, Irad, Methusael, and Lamech of one table corresponding to Jared, Enoch, Methuselah, and Lamech of the other, it was concluded that these are only variants of the same identical genealogy, which one writer has attached to one of the sons of Adam, and the other to another; and that every divergence in the two lists is a discrepancy involving an error on one side or on the other, if not in both. So in chapter xii the Jehovist tells how Abraham, apprehensive that the monarch of the country in which he was would be attracted by his wife's beauty, prevaricated by saying that she was his sister, what perils thence arose to both, and how they were finally extricated. In chapter xx the Elohist relates a similar story of prevarication, peril, and deliverance. The same event, it is alleged, must be the basis of both accounts, but there is a hopeless contradiction between them. The former declares that the occurrence

took place in Egypt, and that Pharaoh was a party to the transaction; the latter transfers the scene to the land of the Philistines and the court of Abimelech. And to complicate the matter still further, the Jehovist gives yet another version of the same story in chapter xxvi, according to which it was not Abraham, but Isaac, who thus declared his wife to be his sister, running an imminent hazard by so doing, but making a fortunate escape. According to the Elohist (xxi, 22-32), Abraham had a difficulty with Abimelech in respect to a well of water, which was amicably settled by a covenant, in memory of which he gave name to Beersheba. The Jehovist (xxvi, 17-33) relates a similar story of strife concerning wells, a visit by Abimelech, an agreement with him, and the naming of Beersheba in consequence; but he says that it was not Abraham, but Isaac, who was concerned in it.

Meanwhile a more extreme disintegration found favor with Vater (1805), Hartmann (1831), and others, who advocated what is known as the fragmentary hypothesis. This may be fitly characterized as the documentary hypothesis run mad. It is a *reductio ad absurdum* furnished by the more consistent and thoroughgoing application of the principles and methods of its predecessor. Instead of two continuous documents pieced together paragraph by paragraph to constitute the Pentateuch as we now have it, each paragraph or section is now traced to a separate and independent source. The compiler was not limited to two writings covering alike the entire period that he proposed to treat, but had before him all that he could gather of every sort relating to his subject, some of which possibly were mere scraps, others of larger compass, some recording, it may be, but a single incident, others more comprehensive, and he adopted one passage from one, another from another, and so on throughout.

Sometimes two or more fragments may have been taken from the same original work, but this cannot be positively affirmed. And it would be vain to attempt to inquire into the extent, character, and aim of the writings from which they were severally extracted. All that we know of them is derived from such portions as the compiler has seen fit to preserve.

The arguments adduced in support of the fragmentary hypothesis were substantially identical with those which had been urged in favor of the documentary hypothesis. And assuming the soundness of those arguments, this is the inevitable consequence. Admit the legitimacy of this disintegrating process, and there is no limit to which it may not be carried at the pleasure of the operator; and it might be added, there is no work to which it might not be applied. Any book in the Bible or out of the Bible could be sliced and splintered in the same way and by the same method of argument. Let a similarly minute and searching examination be instituted into the contents of any modern book; let any one page be compared with any other, and every word and form of expression and grammatical construction and rhetorical figure in one that does not occur in the other be noted as difference of diction and style; let every thought in one that has its counterpart in the other be paraded as parallel sections evidencing diversity of origin and authorship, and every thought which has not its counterpart in the other as establishing a diversity in the ideas of the authors of the two pages respectively; let every conclusion arrived at on one page that does not appear on the other argue different tendencies in the two writers, different aims with which and different influences under which they severally wrote, and nothing would be easier, if this method of proof be allowed, than to demonstrate that each successive page came from a different pen.

The very same process by which the Pentateuch is decomposed into documents can with like facility divide these documents and subdivide them and subdivide them again. Indeed, the advocates of the documentary hypothesis may here be summoned as witnesses against themselves. They currently admit different Elohist and Jehovists, and successive variant editions of each document, and a whole school of priestly and Deuteronomic diaskeuasts and redactors, thus rivaling in their refinements the multitudinous array of the fragmentary critics. And, in fact, the extent to which either may go in this direction is determined by purely subjective considerations. The only limitation is that imposed by the taste or fancy of the critic. If the repetitions or parallel sections alleged to be found in the Pentateuch require that assumption of distinct documents, like repetitions occurring in each individual document prove it to be composite. The very same sort of contraries or contradictions which are made a pretext for sundering the Pentateuch can furnish an equally plausible reason for sundering each of the documents. And if certain criteria are regarded as characteristic of a given document and their absence from sections attributed to the other is held to prove that they are by a different hand from the former, why does not the same rule apply to the numerous sections of the first named document, from which its own so-called characteristic words and phrases are likewise absent?

The titles and subscriptions attached to genealogies and legal sections supplied an additional argument, of which the advocates of the fragmentary hypothesis sought to avail themselves. Such titles as the following are prefixed to indicate the subject of the section that follows: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth" (Gen. ii, 4). "This is the book of the



generations of Adam " (v, 1). " These are the names of the sons of Levi according to their generations " (Exod. vi, 16). " This is the law of the trespass offering " (Lev. vii, 1). " This is the law of the sacrifice of peace offerings " (verse 11). " These are the journeys of the children of Israel " (Num. xxxiii, 1). Or subscriptions are added at the close suggestive of the contents of the section that precedes, such as: " These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations " (Gen. x, 32). " These be the sons of Leah " (xlvi, 15). " These are the sons of Zilpah " (verse 18). " These are the sons of Rachel " (verse 22). " This is the law of the burnt offering, of the meat offering, and of the sin offering," etc. (Lev. vii, 37, 38). " This is the law of the plague of leprosy," etc. (xiii, 59). These indicate divisions in the subject-matter, and mark the beginning or end of paragraphs or sections, and contribute to clearness by brief statements of their general purport; but they do not prove that these sections ever had a separate and independent existence apart from the book in which they are now found, or that different sections proceeded from different authors, any more than like conclusion could be drawn from the books and chapters into which modern works are divided. The extravagance and absurdity of the fragmentary hypothesis could not long escape detection. For

1. It involves the assumption of a numerous body of writings regarding the Mosaic and ante-Mosaic periods, of which there is no other evidence, and which is all out of proportion to the probabilities of the case. Every several paragraph or section is supposed to represent a distinct work, implying a literary activity and a fertility of authorship, which is not only assumed on slender and inadequate grounds, but of which not another fragment survives, to which no allusion is made, whether in the

Pentateuch itself or elsewhere, and not a hint or a trace is anywhere preserved of its ever having existed.

2. A congeries of fragments borrowed from diverse quarters could only form a body of disconnected anecdotes or a heterogeneous miscellany. It could not possibly result in the production of such a work as the Pentateuch, which is a coherent whole, possessing orderly arrangement in accordance with a well-devised plan, which is consistently carried out, with a continuous and connected narrative, with no abrupt transitions and no such contrasts or discords as would inevitably arise from piecing together what was independently conceived and written by different persons at different times, and with no regard to mutual adjustment. As in oriental writings generally, the successive portions are more loosely bound together in outward form than is customary in modern occidental style; but the matter of the record is throughout continuous, and one constant aim is steadfastly pursued. The breaks and interruptions which are alleged to exist in the narrative, such as the failure to record in full the abode in Egypt, the private life of Moses, or the forty years wandering in the wilderness, are no indications of a lack of unity, but the reverse; for they show with what tenacity the writer adhered to his proper theme and excluded everything which did not belong to it.

3. Still further, the Pentateuch is not only possessed of a demonstrable unity of structure, which renders its fragmentary origin inconceivable, but there are throughout manifest allusions from one part to another, one section either referring in express terms to what is contained in others or implying their existence, being based upon those that precede and unintelligible without them, and presupposing those that follow. The minute examinations to which this very hypothesis has driven the friends

of truth have shown that such explicit or tacit allusions are traceable everywhere ; and wherever they occur they make it clear that the writer must have been cognizant of the paragraphs alluded to, and have felt at liberty to assume that his readers were acquainted with them likewise. Of course this is quite inconsistent with the notion that each of these paragraphs came from a different source and was written independently of the rest.

Repelled by the inconsistencies and incongruities of the fragmentary hypothesis, De Wette, Bleek, Tuch, Knobel, and others advocated what is known as the supplementary hypothesis. This is a modification of the documentary, not on the side of a still further and indefinite division, but on the opposite side of a closer union. It was consequently a reaction in the right direction; a confession that what had been sundered without limit, as though its several parts were void of all coherence, really do belong together. It is an admission, so far as it goes, of the cogency of the arguments by which the various parts of the Pentateuch can be shown to be linked together.

The supplementary hypothesis retained the Elohist and the Jehovist of the older theory, but, instead of making each the author of a distinct and independent document, which were subsequently combined and pieced together by a different hand, it supposed that the Elohist first prepared his treatise, which lies at the basis throughout the Pentateuch and constitutes its groundwork. The Jehovist, who lived later, undertook to prepare an enlarged edition of this older history. He accordingly retained all that was in the earlier work, preserving its form and language, only introducing into it and incorporating with it sections of his own, supplying omissions and amplifying what needed to be more fully stated, supplementing it by means of such materials as were within his

reach, and making such additions as he esteemed important.

This form of the hypothesis not only provides, as the old document theory had done, for those evidences of unity which bind the various Elohim passages to one another, and also the various Jehovah passages, but it accounts still further for the fact, inexplicable on the document theory, that the Jehovah sections are related to the Elohim sections, presuppose them, or contain direct and explicit allusions to them. This is readily explained by the supplementary hypothesis; for not only would the Elohist and Jehovist be aware of what they had respectively written or of what they intended to write in the course of their work, but in addition the Jehovist is supposed to have the treatise of the Elohist in his hands, to which all that he writes himself is merely supplemental. It is quite natural for him, therefore, to make allusions to what the Elohist had written. But it is not so easy to account for the fact, which is also of repeated occurrence, that the Elohim passages allude to or presuppose the contents of Jehovah passages. Here the theory signally breaks down; for by the hypothesis the Elohist wrote first an independent production without any knowledge of and of course without the possibility of making any reference to the additions which the Jehovist was subsequently to make.

Another halting place in this hypothesis was the impossibility of making out any consistent view of the relation in which the Jehovist stood to the antecedent labors of the Elohist. The great proof, which was insisted upon, of the existence of the Jehovist as distinct from the Elohist and supplementing the treatise of the latter, lies in the diversity of style and thought which are alleged to characterize these two classes of sections respectively. Hence it was necessary to assume that the

Jehovist faithfully retained the language of the Elohim document unaltered, and that his own peculiarities were limited to the sections which he introduced himself, and that there they were exhibited freely and without reserve. It is frequently the case, however, that the ideas or diction which have been represented to belong to one of these classes of sections are found likewise in the other class. Thus Elohim passages are found to contain words and phrases which have been alleged to characterize the Jehovist, and to contain ideas and statements which are said to be peculiarly Jehovistic. Here it is necessary to affirm that the Jehovist, instead of faithfully transcribing the Elohim document, has altered its language and inserted expressions or ideas of his own. Again, Jehovah passages are found in which those characteristics of style and thought appear which are elsewhere claimed as peculiar to the Elohist. This is explained by saying that the Jehovist in such cases has imitated the style or adopted the ideas of the Elohist, and has sought to make his own additions conform as far as possible to the characteristic style of the work which he is supplementing. Again, while it is alleged that the Elohim and Jehovah passages are for the most part clearly distinguishable, there are instances in which it is difficult, if not impossible, to draw a sharp line of demarkation between contiguous Elohim and Jehovah passages and to determine precisely where one ends and the other begins. Here the Jehovist is thought to have used art to cover up his additions. He has fitted them with such care and skill to the work of his predecessor that the point of junction cannot be discerned, and it has been made to look like one continuous composition. Instead of allowing, as in other instances, his insertions to remain visibly distinct from the original document, he has acted as if he desired to confuse his additions

with the preexisting work and to make their separation impossible.

Now, apart from the fact that these attempted explanations of phenomena at variance with the primary hypothesis are merely shifts and subterfuges to evade the difficulty which they create, and that this is bringing unproved hypotheses to support an hypothesis, every fresh addition making the superstructure weaker instead of confirming it, the view which is thus presented of the Jehovist is inconsistent with itself. At one time we must suppose him to allow the most obvious diversity of style and ideas between the Elohist sections and his own without the slightest concern or any attempt at producing conformity; at others he modifies the language of the Elohist, or carefully copies him in the sections which he adds himself, in order to effect this conformity, though no special motive can be assigned for this difference in his conduct. He sometimes leaves his additions unconnected with the original work which he is supplementing: at other times he weaves them in so adroitly as to create the appearance of continuity, and this again without any assignable motive. An hypothetical personage, who has to be represented by turns as artless and artful, as an honest reporter and a designing interpolator, as skillful and a bungler, as greatly concerned about a conformity of style and thought in some passages of which he is wholly regardless in others, and of whose existence we have no other evidence than that afforded by these contradictory allegations respecting him, can scarcely be said to have his reality established thus. And an hypothesis which is reduced to the necessity of bolstering itself up in this way has not yet reached firm footing.

The simplicity of the supplementary hypothesis, which was its chief recommendation, proved inadequate to relieve the complications which beset the path of the

divisive critics. Attempts to remedy these inconveniences were accordingly made in different lines by Ewald and Hupfeld, both of whom, but particularly the latter, contributed to smooth the way for their successors. Ewald's maiden publication, in 1822, was directed against the extreme disintegration of the fragmentary hypothesis. His own scheme, proposed twenty years later, has been appropriately called the crystallization hypothesis. This is a modification of the supplementary by increasing the number engaged in supplementing from one to a series successively operating at distinct periods. The nucleus, or most ancient portion, of the Pentateuch, in his opinion, consisted of the remnants of four primitive treatises now existing only in fragments imbedded in the various strata which were subsequently accumulated around them. This was followed in the second place by what he calls the Book of the Origins, and this by what he denominates the third, fourth, and fifth prophetic narrators, each of whom in succession added his accretion to what had been previously recorded, and the last of whom worked over all that preceded, together with his own additions and alterations, into one continuous work. Then the Deuteronomist wrote Deuteronomy, which was first issued as an independent publication, but was subsequently incorporated with the work of his predecessors. And thus the Pentateuch, or rather the Hexateuch (for the Pentateuch and Joshua were regarded by him, as by the majority of advanced modern critics generally, as one work)—thus the Hexateuch slowly grew to its present dimensions, a vast conglomerate, including these various accessions made in the course of many centuries.

Hupfeld undertook to remove the obstacles which blocked the way of the supplementary hypothesis in a different manner—not by introducing fresh supplements,

but by abandoning the supplementing process altogether and falling back upon the documentary hypothesis, of which he proposed an important modification. He aimed chiefly to establish two things: First, that the Jehovist sections were not disconnected additions to a preexisting document. In order to this he attempted to bridge over the breaks and chasms by the aid of scattered clauses arbitrarily sundered from their context in intervening Elohim sections, and thus made a shift to preserve a scanty semblance of continuity. In the second place, he maintained the composite character of the Elohist sections, and that they constituted not one but two documents. The troublesome passages, which corresponded with the characteristics of neither the Elohist nor the Jehovist, but appeared to combine them both, were alleged to be the product of a third writer, who, while he used the name Elohim, had the diction and other peculiarities of the Jehovist, and whom he accordingly called the second Elohist. Upon this scheme there were three independent documents, that of the first Elohist, the second Elohist, and the Jehovist. And these were put together in their present form by a redactor, who allowed himself the liberty of inserting, retrenching, modifying, transposing, and combining at his own pleasure. All references from one document to the contents of another, and in general any phenomena that conflict with the requirements of the hypothesis, are ascribed to the redactor.

There are several halting places in this scheme of Hupfeld:

1. One is that the creation of a second Elohist destroys the continuity and completeness of the first. The second Elohist is supposed to begin abruptly with the twentieth chapter of Genesis. From that point onward to the end of the book, with the exception of



chapter xxiii, which records the death and burial of Sarah, the great body of the Elohim passages are given to the second Elohist, and nothing reserved for the first but 'occasional disconnected scraps, which never could have formed a separate and independent record, and which, moreover, are linked with and imply much that is assigned to the other documents. So that it is necessary to assume that this document once contained the very matter which has been sundered from it.

2. It is also a suspicious circumstance that the first Elohist breaks off almost entirely so near the point where the second Elohist begins. All Elohist passages before Gen. xx are given to the first Elohist; all after that, with trifling exceptions, to the second Elohist. This looks more like the severance of what was once continuous than the disentangling of documents once separate, which the redactor had worked together section by section in compiling his history.

3. Another suspicious circumstance is the intricate manner in which the Jehovist and second Elohist are thought to be combined. In many passages they are so intimately blended that they cannot be separated. And in general it is admitted to be impossible to establish any clearly defined criteria of language, style, or thought between them. This has the appearance of a factitious division of what is really the product of a single writer. There is no reason of any moment, whether in the diction or in the matter, for assuming that the Jehovist and the second Elohist were distinct writers.

4. It is indeed claimed that the first Elohist is clearly distinguishable in diction and in matter from the Jehovist and the second Elohist. But there are several considerations which quite destroy the force of the argument for distinct documents from this source. (*a*) If the Elohim

sections prior to Gen. xx are thought to have a diction different from that of the Jehovist, and the great body of the Elohim sections after Gen. xx have a diction confessedly indistinguishable from that of the Jehovist, the presumption certainly is that the difference alleged in the early chapters rests on too limited an induction; and when the induction is carried further it appears that the conclusion has been too hasty, and that no real difference exists. (*b*) Again, the great bulk of the narrative of Genesis, so far as it concerns transactions in ordinary life, is divided between the Jehovist and the second Elohist. The first Elohist is limited to genealogies, legal sections, extraordinary events, such as the creation and flood, or mere isolated notices, as of births, deaths, migrations, etc. That matter of a different description should call for the use of a different set of words, while in matter of the same sort like words are used, is just what might be expected; and there is no need of assuming different documents in order to account for it. (*c*) Still further, when, as in Gen. xxxiv, a narrative is for special reasons assigned in part to the first Elohist, it is as impossible to distinguish its diction from that of the other documents as it elsewhere is to distinguish the diction of the second Elohist from that of the Jehovist; and other grounds of distinction must be resorted to to effect a separation. All this makes it evident that the variant diction alleged is due to the difference in the matter, and not to diversity of documents.

5. The function assigned to the redactor assumes that he acts in the most capricious and inconsistent manner, more so even than the Jehovist of the supplementary hypothesis. At times he is represented as scrupulously careful to preserve everything contained in his various sources, though it leads to needless and unmeaning repetition; at others he omits large and important sections,

though the document from which they are dropped is thus reduced to a mutilated remnant.

Where his sources disagree he sometimes retains the narrative of each unchanged, thus placing the whole case fairly before his readers; at others he alters them into correspondence, which is hardly consistent with historical honesty. Variant narratives of the same event are sometimes harmonized by combining them, thus confusing both; sometimes they are mistaken for distinct and even widely separated events and related as such—an error which reflects upon his intelligence, since critics, with the incomplete data which he has left them, are able to correct it. He sometimes reproduces his sources just as he finds them; at others he alters their whole complexion by freely manipulating the text or making additions of his own. Everything in diction, style, or ideas which is at variance with the requirements of the hypothesis is laid to his account and held to be due to his interference. The present text does not suit the hypothesis; therefore it must have been altered, and the redactor must have done it.

It is evident how convenient it is to have a redactor always at hand to whom every miscarriage of the hypothesis can be attributed. But it is also evident that the frequent necessity for invoking his aid seriously weakens the cause which he is summoned to support. It is further evident that the suspicions cast upon the accuracy with which the redactor has transmitted the various texts which he had before him undermines the entire basis of the hypothesis; for it undertakes to establish the existence of so-called documents and to discriminate between them by verbal criteria, which are nullified if the original exits have been tampered with. And it is still further evident that the opposite traits of character impliedly ascribed to the redactor the utterly capricious and irra-

tional conduct imputed to him; and the wanton and aimless manipulation of his authorities, for which no motive can be assigned, tends to make this most important functionary an impossible conception.

Both Ewald and Hupfeld were regarded at the time as having made a retrogradation instead of an advance, by falling back from the simplicity of the then dominant supplementary hypothesis into a greater complexity than that of the original document hypothesis. The fact is, however, that the complexity inevitably grows, as the critics aim at greater precision and endeavor to adapt their scheme more exactly to the phenomena with which they have to deal. The multiplication of machinery, which is necessary before all can work smoothly so overloads their apparatus that it is in danger of breaking down by its own weight. They find themselves obliged to pile hypothesis upon hypothesis in order to relieve difficulties and explain diversities, and account for irregularities by subdivided documents, and successive recensions, and a series of redactors and unfathered glosses and variegated legal strata and diaskeuasts in unlimited profusion, until the whole thing reaches a stage of confusion worse confounded, almost equivalent to that of the exploded fragmentary hypothesis itself.

The next stage of the critical movement, which issued in the present reigning school of divisive criticism, wrought as sudden and complete a revolution in the ideas of scholars of this class as the speculations of Darwin effected in natural history, when the denial of the unity of the human race collapsed on the instant, and it was held instead that all animated being had sprung from a common germ. And the lever which effected the overthrow was in both cases the same; that is, the doctrine of development. This at once exalted the speculations of Ewald and Hupfeld to a prominence

which they had not previously attained, and made them important factors in the new advance. From Ewald was borrowed the idea that the composition of the Pentateuch was not accomplished at a stroke, by one act, whether of supplementing or of combining preexisting documents, but took place in successive stages by a series of enlarging combinations. From Hupfeld were derived the two pillars of his scheme, the continuity of the Jehovist document and the composite character of the Elohist, or, in other words, that the Jehovist did not merely make additions to a preexisting work, but wrote an independent work of his own, and that there were two Elohist instead of one. Thus both Ewald and Hupfeld, without intending or imagining it, smoothed the way for the rise of a school of criticism with ideas quite diverse from their own.

The various attempts to partition the Pentateuch had thus far been based on exclusively literary grounds. Diction, style, ideas, the connection of paragraphs and sentences, supplied the staple arguments for each of the forms which the hypotheses had assumed, and furnished the criteria from which all conclusions were drawn. Numerous efforts had been made to ascertain the dates to which the writers severally belonged. Careful studies were instituted to discover the bias under which they respectively wrote as suggesting the influences by which they might be supposed to be surrounded, and hence their historical situation. They were diligently searched for historical allusions that might afford clew; but with all the pains that were taken no sure footing could be found, and the critics agreed not together. Conjectures ranged *ad libitum* through the ages from the time of Moses or his immediate successor, Joshua, to that of Josiah, eight centuries later. And while the internal criteria were so vague there was no external support on

which the whole hypothesis could rest, no objective proof that the entire fabric was not a sheer figment of the imagination. Amid all the diversities, however, two points were universally agreed upon and regarded as settled beyond contradiction: 1. The Elohist was the groundwork of the Pentateuch; it supplied the scheme or general plan into which the other parts were fitted. And as it was the oldest, so it was historically the most reliable and trustworthy portion. The Jehovist was more legendary, depending, as it was believed to do, upon later and less credible traditions. 2. Deuteronomy was the latest and the crowning portion of the Pentateuch, by the addition of which the whole work was rendered complete.

Here the development hypothesis came in with its revolutionary conclusions. It supplied the felt lack of its predecessors by fixing definite dates and offering objective proof of their correctness. The conclusions deduced from the examination of the Pentateuch itself are verified by an appeal to the history. Arguments are drawn, not, as heretofore, from the narratives of the Pentateuch, but from its institutions; not from its historical portion, but from its laws. The principle of development is applied. The simplest forms of legislation are to be considered the most primitive. As the Israelites developed in the course of ages from rude nomadic tribes to a settled and well-organized nation their legislation naturally grew in complexity and extent. Now the Pentateuch obviously contains three distinct codes or bodies of law: One in Exod. xx, 23, which is called in the original text the book of the covenant. This Moses is said to have written and read to the assembled people at Mount Sinai as the basis of the covenant relation there formally ratified between Jehovah and Israel. Another is the Deuteronomic law, which Moses is said

to have rehearsed to the people in the plains of Moab shortly before his death, and to have delivered in writing to the custody of the priests, to be laid up alongside the ark of the covenant. A third is the ritual law, or priest code, contained in the latter chapters of Exodus, the Book of Leviticus, and certain chapters of Numbers. This law is declared in the general and in all its parts to have been communicated by God to Moses.

Advocates of this hypothesis, however, take issue with these explicit statements, and affirm that these codes could not have had the origin attributed to them. The book of the covenant, from its simplicity and brevity, must have belonged to an early stage in the history of the people. From this there is a great advance in the Deuteronomic code; and the ritual law, or priest code, is much the most minute and complicated of all. Long periods must have elapsed and great changes have taken place in the condition of the people to have wrought such changes in their institutions. The book of the covenant, primitive as it is, nevertheless could not have been enacted in the desert; for it has laws respecting fields and vineyards, and olive yards and standing grain and grain in shocks, and offerings of first fruit and six years of tillage, with a sabbatical year whose spontaneous products should be for the poor and the beast of the field, and harvest feast and feasts of ingathering. All these have no application to a people in the desert. They belonged to a settled people engaged in agriculture. Such a law could only have been given after the settlement of the people of Canaan.

The law of Deuteronomy, while greatly expanded beyond the book of the covenant in its provisions, has one marked and characteristic feature which serves to define the period to which it belongs. The book of the covenant (Exod. xx, 24) sanctions altars in all places where

God records his name. Deuteronomy, on the other hand (chapter xii), strictly limits the offering of sacrifice to the one place which Jehovah should choose. Now, it is said, the period of the judges and the early kings is marked by a multiplicity of altars and worship in high places in accordance with the book of the covenant. But in the reign of King Josiah, more than eight hundred years after the settlement in Canaan, the high places were abolished and sacrifice was restricted to the altar in Jerusalem. And this was done in obedience to the requirements of a book of the law then found in the temple (1 Kings xxii, 8). That book was Deuteronomy. It was the soul of the entire movement. And this is the period to which it belongs.

This new departure, though successful so long as the pious Josiah lived, spent its force when he was taken away; and under his ungodly successors the people relapsed again into the worship on high places, the popular attachment to which had not been eradicated. This was effectually broken, however, by the Babylonish captivity, which severed the people from the spots which they had counted sacred, until all the old associations had faded away. The returning exiles, impoverished and few in number, were bent only on restoring the temple in Jerusalem, and had no other place at which to worship. It was, then, under these circumstances that Ezra came forth with a fresh book of law adapted to the new state of things and engaged the people to obedience (Neh. viii). This book was the ritual law, or the priest code. It also limits sacrifice to one place, as was done by Deuteronomy, but in the latter this was regarded as a new departure, which it would be difficult to introduce, and which is, therefore, reiterated and insisted upon with great urgency. In the priest code, on the contrary, it is quietly assumed as a matter of course, as though



nothing else was thought of, and this had been the established rule from the time of Moses.

It had been customary for critics to attribute the priest code to the Elohist, and the book of the covenant to the Jehovist; so that the former was considered the first and the latter the second legislation. Graf, who in his famous essay on the "Historical Books of the Old Testament," in 1866, undertook to reverse this order in the manner already indicated, felt it necessary to separate the historical from the legal portion of the Elohist document, and to maintain that while the former was the oldest portion of the Pentateuch the latter was the latest. It was promptly shown, however, in opposition to Graf, that such a separation was impossible. The connection between the Elohist histories and the ritual legislation was too intimate to be severed. Kuenen, professor in Leyden, then boldly grasped the situation, accepted the order of the legislation proposed by Graf, and intrepidly contended, against the unanimous voice of all antecedent critics, that the entire Elohist document, history and legislation, was the latest constituent of the Pentateuch. This reversal of all former beliefs on this subject, rendered necessary by the development hypothesis, met at first with determined opposition. It was not until 1878, fifteen years ago, that Julius Wellhausen assumed its advocacy in the first volume of his *History of Israel*. His skillful presentation won for it a sudden popularity, and it has since been all the rage in Germany. Fifteen years of supremacy in that land of speculation is scarcely sufficient, however, to guarantee its permanence even there. The history of the past would rather lead one to expect that in no long time it will be replaced by some fresh novelty.

This reversal of the order of the Elohist and the Jehovist at once put an end to the supplemental

hypothesis. For the Jehovist could not have made additions to the Elohist document if that document did not come into existence until centuries after his time. It thus became necessary to assume that the Jehovist passages, however isolated and fragmentary, constituted a separate document; and the continuity was made out as proposed by Hupfeld, by using scattered clauses torn from their connection to bridge the chasms. The second Elohist of Hupfeld also became a necessity, though now supposed to antedate the first. The passages in the patriarchal history alluded to by Hosea and other early prophets must be eliminated from the Elohist document before this can be reckoned postexilic. The great bulk of the history is accordingly made over to the second Elohist, and so this argument of early date is evaded. In this manner the way is smoothed for turning all former conceptions of the critics regarding the formation of the Pentateuch upside down. The Elohim document, from being the oldest and most reliable, becomes the latest and the least trustworthy. It is even charged that its facts are manufactured for a purpose; that the author makes statements, not because he has evidence of their truth, but because they correspond with his ideas of what ought to have occurred, and which he therefore imagines must have occurred. Instead of representing the Mosaic age as it really was, he gives, as Dr. Driver expressed it (Introduction to Old Testament, p. 120), "an ideal picture" of it.

For the sake of brevity the Pentateuchal documents are commonly denoted by symbols. Dr. Dillmann, a strenuous opposer to the Wellhausen hypothesis, though adopting many of his conclusions in detail, employs the first four letters of the alphabet, indicating thereby their chronological order. He calls the Elohist A, the second Elohist B, the Jehovist C, and the Deuteronomist D,

thus emphasizing his adherence to the old critical arrangement. In the nomenclature that is now most prevalent the term Elohist is applied exclusively to what used to be known as the second Elohist, and it is represented by E, the Jehovist by J. J and E are regarded as the oldest of the documents, and as belonging six or seven centuries after the exodus. They are alleged to have emanated from prophetic circles, J in the southern kingdom of Judah and E in the northern kingdom of Israel; critics are not agreed which preceded the other. They were combined by a redactor into the composite work, JE, prior to the production of Deuteronomy, D, in the reign of Josiah, or shortly before, eight centuries after the exodus. This was then added to the preceding by another redactor, thus forming JED. The second Elohist having been separated from what used to be known as the Elohist document, the remnant was by Wellhausen fancifully called Q, the initial of quatuor—4, because of the four covenants it contains. Others prefer to designate it as P, the priestly writer, in distinction from the prophetic historians, J and E. P was produced after the exile, and was subsequently added by another redactor to the preexisting JED; then the Pentateuch was complete.

In this hasty recital of the current critical view of the date of the several documents, and of their gradual combination, no note is taken of subordinate features of the process, such as J', J'', E', E'', P', P'', P''''', the subdivisions of the documents, the successive editions, the various strata of the ritual, and the entire complicated series of subsidiary personages who are supposed to have had a hand in building up the Pentateuch to its present form. A general outline of the course of procedure is all that has been attempted.

It has already been remarked, as is indeed obvious

upon its face, that the development hypothesis flatly contradicts throughout the account which the Pentateuch gives of itself. The laws are all explicitly declared to have been Mosaic, to have been written down by Moses, or to have been communicated to him directly from the Lord. And there is no good reason for discrediting the biblical statements on this subject. The three codes belong precisely where the Scripture narrative places them, and they are entirely appropriate in that position. The elementary character of the book of the covenant is explained, not by its superior antiquity, but by its preliminary purpose. It was a brief body of regulations intended to serve as a basis for the formal ratification of the covenant between Jehovah and the people of Israel. Accordingly, all that was required was a few simple and comprehensive rules, framed in the spirit of the religion of Jehovah for the government of the people in their relations to one another and in their relation to God, to which, in a solemn act of worship, they were to pledge assent. After this fundamental act had been duly performed, and the covenant relation had thus been instituted and acknowledged by both the contracting parties, the way was open for a fuller development of the duties and obligations involved in this relation. Jehovah, as the covenant God of Israel, would henceforth take up his abode in the midst of his people. This made it necessary that detailed instructions should be given, for which there was no occasion before, respecting the construction of the sacred tabernacle, the services to be performed in it, the officiating priesthood, the set times for special solemnities, and in general the entire ritual to be observed by a holy people for the expression and perpetuation of their communion with a holy God. All this was embodied in the priest code, in which the scanty general provisions of the book of the covenant regarding

divine worship were replaced by a vastly expanded and minutely specified ceremonial. This was not a development implying the lapse of ages with an altered civilization and a corresponding advance in the popular notions of the divine Being and of the homage that should be paid to him.

At the close of the forty years' wandering, when the great legislator was about to die, he recapitulated in the audience of the people the laws already given in the book of the covenant, with such modifications and additions as were suggested by the circumstances in which they were placed, the experience of the past, and the prospect of the future. The Deuteronomic code thus enacted was a development, not as the priest code had been, on the side of the ritual, but considered as a code for popular guidance in civil and religious matters. The enlargement, which we here find, of the simple regulations of the book of the covenant implies no longer interval and no greater change in the condition or constitution of the people than is provided for in the Scripture narrative. And at the same time the fact that we do not find in Deuteronomy a ritual so elaborate and minutely detailed as in Leviticus is not because Leviticus is the further development of a still later period, when ceremonies were more multiplied and held in higher esteem, but simply because Leviticus was a professional book and Deuteronomy was a popular book. Leviticus was for the guidance of the priests, who were professionally charged with the oversight and direction of the ceremonial, and Deuteronomy for the guidance of the people in matters more immediately within their province. Medical works for the instruction of physicians must necessarily be more minute than sanitary rules for popular use. And if it would be absurd to say that the same eminent physician could not produce both

a professional and a popular treatise on medicine it is equally so to insist, as the critics do, that Deuteronomy and Leviticus cannot both be from the same age and the same legislator.

It is further to be observed that the agricultural allusions in the book of the covenant are not in conflict with its Mosaic origin and its delivery at Sinai. The people were on their way to Canaan. This land had been promised to their fathers, and the Lord had renewedly promised to give it to them. It was with this expectation that they left Egypt. For this they were marching through the desert. Canaan was their anticipated home, the goal of their hopes. They confidently trusted that they would soon be settled there in full possession. That there was to be even so much as a delay of forty years, and that the entire adult generation was to pass away before this hope was fulfilled never entered the mind of the leader or the people, since neither could have imagined such an act of gross rebellion as that for which they were sentenced to perish in the wilderness. It would have been strange indeed if the law given under these circumstances did not look beyond the desert as their abode and took no note of what was in immediate prospect. It was quite appropriate for it to contemplate their expected life in Canaan and to give regulations respecting the fields and vineyards and olive yards which they were shortly to possess.

And there is no such difference as is pretended between the book of the covenant and the other Mosaic codes in respect to the place of legitimate sacrifice. It is not true that the former sanctioned a multiplicity of altars and that this was the recognized practice of pious worshipers of Jehovah until the reign of Josiah, and that he instituted a new departure from all previous law and custom by

restricting sacrifice to one central altar in compliance with a book of the law then for the first time promulgated. The unity of the altar was the law of Israel's life from the beginning, even in the days of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, coexisting in various parts of the land. They built altars and offered sacrifice in whatever part of the land they might be, particularly in places where Jehovah appeared to them. But the patriarchal family was a unit; and while they worshiped in different places successively, in the course of the migrations, they nevertheless worshiped in but one place at a time. They did not offer sacrifice contemporaneously on different altars. So with Israel in their marches through the wilderness. They set up their altars wherever they encamped, at various places successively, but not in more than one place at the same time. This is the state of things which is recognized and made legitimate in the book of the covenant. In Exod. xx, 24, the Israelites are authorized to erect an altar, not wherever they may please, but in all places where God records his name. The critics interpret this as a direct sanction given to various sanctuaries in different parts of Palestine. There is no foundation whatever for such an interpretation. There is not a word here nor anywhere in Scripture from which the legitimacy of the multitudinous sanctuaries of a later time can be inferred. An altar is lawful, and sacrifice upon it acceptable, and God will there meet with his people and bless them only where he records his name; not where men may utter his name, whether by invocation or proclamation, but where God reveals or manifests himself. He manifested himself gloriously on Sinai amidst awful indications of his presence. This was Moses's warrant for building an altar there (Exod. xxiv, 4). When the tabernacle was erected and the ark deposited in it as the abiding symbol of the divine presence, that

became the spot where God recorded his name, and to which all sacrifices were to be brought (Lev. xvii, 5). So that wherever the tabernacle or the ark was stationed an altar might properly be erected and sacrifices offered.

And Deut. xii looks forward to the time when Israel should be permanently settled in the land which Jehovah their God was giving them to inherit, and he should have given them rest from all their enemies round about so that they should dwell in safety ; then he would choose a place out of all their tribes to put his name there, and that should thenceforth be his habitation and the sole place of legitimate sacrifice. These conditions were not fulfilled until the peaceful reign of Solomon, who by divine direction built the temple as Jehovah's permanent abode. Here the Most High placed his name by filling it with his effulgent glory at its dedication, and thenceforward this was the one place whither the people went up to meet with God and worship him by sacrifice ; thither they directed their prayers, and from his holy hill of Zion God sent forth his help and his salvation.

There is thus the most entire concord between the several codes in regard to the place of sacrifice. It was from the beginning limited to the place of divine manifestation. As this manifestation was on all ordinary occasions restricted first to the Mosaic tabernacle and then to the temple of Solomon, the language of the book of the covenant, no less than that of the Levitical and Deuteronomic codes, demanded that sacrifice should ordinarily be restricted to these sacred edifices. Only the book of the covenant, which lays down the primal and universal law of the Hebrew altar, is wider in its scope, inasmuch as it embraces those extraordinary occasions, likewise, for which there was no need to make express provisions in the other codes. If God manifested himself by an immediate and supernatural appearance else-



where than at the sanctuary, that spot became, not permanently, indeed, but so long as the manifestation lasted, holy ground and a place of legitimate sacrifice. And, on the other hand, if the Most High at any time withdrew his ordinary presence from the sanctuary, as when the ark was captured by the Philistines, the sanctuary ceased to be the place where God recorded his name, the restriction of sacrifice to that spot was *ipse facto* for the time abolished, and in the absence of any definite provision for the regular seat of God's worship the people were left to offer sacrifice as best they might. To the extent of these two exceptional cases the book of the covenant is more comprehensive than the other codes. But it lends no sanction whatever to that irregular and unregulated worship which the critics would make it cover.

After the capture of the ark, and during the period of its seclusion in a private house which followed, the worship on high places had a certain sort of legitimacy, as is expressly stated in I Kings iv, 2, as it had also at a later period in the apostate kingdom of Israel, where the pious were denied access to the house of God in Jerusalem. But apart from these exceptional cases worship at other altars than that at the sanctuary was in violation of the express statute. The critics argue the nonexistence of the law of the unity of the altar from its repeated violation. They might with equal propriety argue that there was no law forbidding the worship of other gods than Jehovah, because the Israelites so often relapsed into the worship of Baal and other foreign deities.

While these various hypotheses which have thus successively arisen, each at the ruin of its predecessor, are, as has been shown, individually encumbered with the insuperable difficulties peculiar to each, the Canaan arguments by which their advocates seek to establish them are insufficient and inconclusive. The alternation of

divine names can be otherwise explained, and it can only be brought into harmony with the partition hypothesis by a free use of the redactor and the assumption of repeated changes of the text. Exod. vi, 3, has not the meaning that the critics attribute to it. The continuity of the documents is broken by serious chasms, or maintained by very questionable methods; and it is necessary to assume in numerous instances that the documents originally contained paragraphs and sections similar to those which the critics now sunder from them. The alleged parallel passages are falsely assumed identifications of distinct events, and the diversity of diction, style, and ideas is made out by utterly fallacious and inconclusive methods.

The great outstanding evidence of unity, which never can be nullified, is the unbroken continuity of the history, the consistent plan upon which the whole is prepared, and the numerous cross references which bond the whole together as the work of one mind. Separate and independent documents, mechanically pieced together, could no more produce such an appearance of unity as reigns throughout the Pentateuch than a faultless statue could be formed out of discordant fragments from different sources.

The partition hypotheses have further been elaborated from the beginning in the interest of unbelief. The unfriendly criticism of an opponent does not indeed absolve us from patiently and candidly examining his arguments and accepting whatever facts he may adduce, though we are not bound by his perverted interpretation of them. Nevertheless we cannot intelligently nor safely overlook the palpable bias against the supernatural which has infected the critical theories which we have been reviewing from first to last. All the acknowledged leaders of the movement have without exception scouted the reality of miracles and prophecy and immediate divine revelation

in their genuine and evangelical sense. Their theories are all inwrought with naturalistic presuppositions, which cannot be disentangled from them without their falling to pieces. Evangelical scholars in Germany, as elsewhere, have steadfastly opposed these theories, refuted their arguments, and exposed malign tendencies. Only recently there has been an attempt at compromise by accepting these critical theories and endeavoring to harmonize them with the Christian faith. But the inherent vice in these systems cannot be eradicated. The invariable result has been to lower the Christian faith to the level of these perverted theories, instead of lifting the latter up to the level of a Christian standard.

The futility of the methods by which the Pentateuch has been parceled into different documents may further be shown by the readiness, with which it can be applied, and with equal success, to writings the unity of which is indisputable. To illustrate this I have applied it to a couple of passages selected at random, the parables of the Prodigal Son and of the Good Samaritan. The fact that a narrative can be so divided as to form two continuous narratives is reckoned by the critics a demonstration of its composite character, and that the parts into which it has been severed are the original sources from which it has been compounded. Let us test this by the parables just referred to :

THE PRODIGAL SON, Luke xv, 11-32.

A

11 A certain man had two sons :  
12 And the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion . . . that falleth to me. . . . 13 He wasted his substance in riotous living. . . . 14 And he began to be in want. . . . 16 And no man gave unto him. . . . 20 And he arose,

B

(A certain man had two sons :)  
. . . 12 And he divided unto them his living. . . . 13 And (one of them) took his journey into a far country. . . . 14 And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that country. . . . 15 And he went and joined himself to one of

and came to his father ; and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. 21 And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight : I am no more worthy to be called thy son. 22 But the father said to his servants, Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put it on him ; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet : . . . 24 For this my son was dead, and is alive again. . . And they began to be merry. 25 Now his elder son was in the field : and as he came and drew nigh to the house, . . . 28 He was angry and would not go in : and his father came out, and entreated him. 29 But he answered and said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and I never transgressed a commandment of thine : and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends : 30 But when this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou killedst for him the fatted calf. 31 And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that is mine is thine. 32 But it was meet to make merry and be glad : for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again.

the citizens of that country ; and he sent him into his fields to feed swine. 16 And he would fain have been filled with the husks that the swine did eat. . . . 17 But when he came to himself he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish here with hunger ! 18 I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight : 19 I am no more worthy to be called thy son : make me as one of thy hired servants. . . . 20 But while he was yet afar off, his father saw him, and was moved with compassion : . . . 23 And (said), Bring the fatted calf, and kill it, and let us eat, and make merry. . . . 25 (And the other son) heard music and dancing. 26 And he called to him one of the servants, and inquired what these things might be. 27 And he said unto him, Thy brother is come ; and thy father hath killed the fatted calf, because he hath received him safe and sound. . . . 32 He was lost and is found.

There are here two complete narratives agreeing in some points and disagreeing in others, each having its special characteristics. The only deficiencies are inclosed in parentheses, and may be readily explained as omissions by the redactor in effecting the combination. A clause must be supplied at the beginning of B, a subject is wanting in verse 13 and verse 25, and the verb " said " is wanting in verse 23.

A and B agree that there were two sons, one of whom received a portion of his father's property and by his own fault was reduced to great destitution, in consequence of which he returned penitently to his father and addressed him in language which is nearly identical in both accounts. The father received him with great tenderness and demonstrations of joy, which attracted the attention of the other son.

The differences are quite as striking as the points of agreement. A distinguishes the sons as elder and younger; B makes no mention of their relative ages. In A the younger obtained his portion by solicitation, and the father retained the remainder in his own possession; in B the father divided his property between both of his sons of his own motion. In A the prodigal remained in his father's neighborhood and reduced himself to penury by riotous living; in B he went to a distant country and spent all his property, but there is no intimation that he indulged in unseemly excesses. It would rather appear that he was injudicious; and to crown his misfortunes there occurred a severe famine. His fault seems to have consisted in having gone so far away from his father and from the Holy Land and in engaging in the unclean occupation of tending swine. In A the destitution seems to have been chiefly want of clothing; in B want of food. Hence in A the father directed the best robe and ring and shoes to be brought for him; in B the fatted calf was killed. In B the son came from a distant land and the father saw him from afar off; in A he came from the neighborhood, and the father ran at once and fell on his neck and kissed him. In B he had been engaged in a menial occupation, and so bethought himself of his father's hired servants, and asked to be made a servant himself; in A he had been living luxuriously, and while confessing his unworthiness makes no request

to be put on the footing of a servant. In A the father speaks of his son having been dead because of his profligate life; in B of his having been lost because of his absence in a distant land. In A, but not in B, the other son was displeased at the reception given to the prodigal. And here it would appear that the redactor has slightly altered the text. The elder son must have said to his father in A, "When this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou didst put on him the best robe." But thinking that this did not make a good contrast with the "kid" the redactor substituted for it the phrase, "thou killedst for him the fatted calf."

## THE GOOD SAMARITAN, Luke x, 29-37.

A

B

29 But he [that is, the lawyer (verse 25)], desiring to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbor? 30 Jesus made answer and said, A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho; . . . and they beat him, . . . leaving him half dead. 31 And by chance a certain priest was going down that way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. . . . 33 But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: . . . 34 And came to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring on them oil and wine, . . . and took care of him. . . . 36 Which of these (three), thinkest thou, proved neighbor unto him? . . . 37 And he said, He that showed mercy on him.

30 (A certain man) fell among robbers, which stripped him . . . and departed. . . . 32 And (in like manner) a Levite (also), when he came to the place (and saw him, passed by on the other side). . . . 33 And when he saw him, he was moved with compassion. . . . 34 And he set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn. . . . 35 And on the morrow he took out two pence, and gave them to the host, and said, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, I, when I come back again, will repay thee. . . .

37 And Jesus said unto him (that fell among the robbers), Go, and do thou likewise.

Both narratives are complete; only a subject must be supplied in B, verse 30 the omission of which was rendered necessary by its being combined with A. The redactor has tampered with the text and materially altered the

sense in verse 32 from his desire to put the Levite on the same plane with the priest (verse 31), the language of which he has borrowed. In other respects the original texts of the two narratives remain unaltered.

Both narratives agree that a man greatly abused by certain parties was treated with generous kindness by a stranger, and that Jesus deduced a practical lesson from it. But they differ materially in detail. A relates his story as a parable of Jesus in answer to a lawyer's question. B makes no mention of the lawyer or his question, but seems to be relating a real history.

The spirit of the two is quite different. A is anti-Jewish, B pro-Jewish. In A the aggressors are Jews, people of Jerusalem or Jericho, or both, and a priest pitilessly leaves the sufferer to his fate, while it is a Samaritan, with whom the Jews were in perpetual feud, who takes pity on him. In B the aggressors are robbers, outlaws whose nationality is not defined, and it is a Levite who shows mercy.

The maltreatment is different. In A the sufferer is beaten and half killed, and needs to have his wounds bound up and liniments applied. In B he was stripped of all he had and left destitute, but no personal injury was inflicted. Accordingly he was taken to an inn and his wants provided for at the expense of his benefactor.

The lesson inculcated is different. In A it is that the duty of loving his neighbors is not limited to those of the same nation, nor annulled by national antipathies. In B it is that he who has been befriended himself should befriend others.

These illustrations may serve to show how the critics create discrepancies and contradictions where none really exist, by sundering what properly belongs together. They also show the inconclusiveness of their method of argument.