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

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

the noble panorama, I could but feel, in the spirit of the king's words, Oh! how small we mortals are in this little corner of creation, compared with the greatness and the glory which fill the universe of God!

G. W. WELDON.

ART. V.—WELLHAUSEN'S THEORY OF THE ORIGIN AND STRUCTURE OF THE PENTATEUCH.—PART I.

Prolegomena to the History of Israel. By JULIUS WELLHAUSEN. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black.

The Pentateuch, its Origin and Structure. By EDWIN C. BISSELL, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

IN considering the last and most popular modern theory of the constitution of the Pentateuch, it may be well to quote the frank confession Wellhausen makes of the method by which he arrived at his present notions. "In my early student days," he says with charming *naïveté*, "I was attracted by the stories of Saul and David, Ahab and Elijah; the discourses of Amos and Isaiah laid strong hold on me, and I read myself well into the prophetical and historical Books of the Old Testament. Thanks to such aids as were accessible to me, I even considered that I understood them tolerably, but at the same time was troubled with a bad conscience, as if I were beginning with the roof instead of the foundation; for I had no thorough acquaintance with the Law. . . . . My enjoyment of 'the historical and prophetical books' was marred by the Law; it did not bring them any nearer to me, but intruded itself uneasily, like a ghost that makes a noise indeed, but is not visible, and really effects nothing. . . . . At last I learned that Graf placed the Law later than the Prophets, and, almost without knowing his reasons for the hypothesis, I was prepared to accept it. I readily acknowledged to myself the possibility of understanding Hebrew antiquity without the Book of the Torah."[1]

The fact that prepossessions count more with this school of critics than is usually avowed amongst scientific men is evident from another statement in the preface to Wellhausen's "Prolegomena." Speaking on the arguments drawn from passages "quoted from Amos and Hosea as implying an acquaintance with the Priestly Code," he calmly remarks that "they were not such as could make any impression on those who were

[1] "Prolegomena," English translation, p. 4.

already persuaded that the latter was the more recent."[1] Can anything be more likely to pervert the findings of a critic than this secret bias, so frankly disclosed, towards a theory that he is determined to establish? We shall give many proofs that this unhappy prepossession attains a fatal ascendency over the mind of Wellhausen, although he has passed through the student phase and now poses as a master in the science.

It may be well to put the theory of the Pentateuch, as now adopted by Wellhausen, into an easily remembered formulary that may be expressed algebraically thus: [JE+D+PC(Q)]R= Pentateuch, or rather Hexateuch. This means that the earliest writers, the Jehovist and Eloist, manipulated a mass of traditions and put them forth side by side, till a third hand re-worked them; this is JE. Then the Deuteronomist made his edition. Then another edition of the "four Covenants" was redacted, and was put into its present form substantially. This is PC(Q). That finally all this many-edited compilation was moulded by unknown hands, and the final result is the Hexateuch, or five Books of Moses, plus a piece of Joshua. It is not to be supposed that these are laid side by side, and one continuous work presented, as if a man should compile a history from four or five monastic chronicles, and leave his mark upon the whole, while he incorporated sections of various lengths from his authorities. On the other hand, the fragments remain separate, as in a mosaic work, and not confused one with another. The character of the conglomerate formed by the various processes is best expressed in Wellhausen's own description: "The Priestly Code," he says, "is not a perfectly incomposite structure; it has one main stock marked by a very definite historical arrangement, and preserved with little admixture in the Book of Genesis; but on the one hand some older elements have been incorporated in this stock, while on the other hand there have been engrafted on it quite a number of later *novellæ*, which in point of form are not absolutely homogeneous with the main body of the Code, but in point of substance are quite similar to it, reflecting the same tendencies and ideas, and using the same expressions and mannerisms, so that the whole may be regarded as an historical unity, though not strictly a literary one."[2]

The first question that presents itself is, by what solvent do the critics loosen this literary mosaic, and by what criterion

[1] "Prolegomena," English translation, p. 11.

[2] Wellhausen, *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. xviii., p. 507. For an exact analysis of PC, and passages attributed to it, see Bissell, p. 83. It wanders from Gen. i. to Josh. xx. 9-34, and often consists of small pieces ending abruptly in the middle of a verse.

do they detect whether a phrase belongs to one or other of the different constituent elements which they are pleased to enumerate in the Pentateuch? We must make, Wellhausen tells us, "two principal assumptions, that the work of the Jehovist, so far as the nucleus of it is concerned, belongs to the course of the Assyrian period, and that Deuteronomy belongs to its close. . . . . Deuteronomy is the starting-point. . . . . When its position has been historically ascertained, we cannot decline to go on, but must demand that the position of the Priestly Code should also be fixed by reference to history."[1] Here the process is revealed: first make the assumption that certain distinct sources exist, and then attribute to them such portions of the Pentateuch as suit your theory. The analysis is then complete.

Before letting our readers see how this process is carried out, we must give them warning as to what they will encounter in the course they are invited to take under the guidance of their new instructors. *They will find the historical character of the records entirely destroyed.* In dealing with the Priestly Code, Wellhausen tells us that "the legal contents are supported on a scaffolding of history, which, however, belongs to the literary form rather than to the substance of the work."[2] With what small compunction he casts down this "historical scaffolding," appears from his cavalier treatment of the giving of the Law. It "has only a formal, not to say dramatic, significance. It is the product of the poetic necessity for such a representation of the manner in which the people was constituted Jehovah's people as should appeal directly and graphically to the imagination. . . . . For the sake of producing a solemn and vivid impression, that is represented as having taken place in a single thrilling moment, which in reality occurred slowly and almost unobserved. Why Sinai should have been chosen as the scene admits of ready explanation. It was the Olympus of the Hebrew people, the earthly seat of the Godhead, and as such it continued to be regarded by the Israelites even after their settlement in Palestine (Judges v. 4, 5)."[3] No wonder, with such views, that disparaging terms are applied to the Hebrew Scriptures, and that we meet with such expressions as these: "the narrator of these legends;" "the recapitulation of the contents of this narrative makes us feel at once what a pious make-up it is, and how full of inherent impossibilities;" "there cannot

[1] "Proleg.," p. 13.

[2] Wellhausen, *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. xviii., p. 506.

[3] *Encycl. Brit.*, vol. xiii., p. 399. The quotation is from the Song of Deborah: "The mountains flowed down at the presence of the Lord; even yon Sinai at the presence of the Lord, the God of Israel."

be a word of truth in the whole narration. Its motives, however, are easily seen;" "unconscious fictions;" "2 Kings xxii. 3, 8, is an interpolation which does credit to Jewish acuteness." Again: "I do not mean to maintain that Abraham was not yet known when Amos wrote, but he scarcely stood by this time at the same stage as Isaac and Jacob. As a saint of Hebron he might be of Calibite origin, and have something to do with Ram (1 Chron. ii.). Abram may stand for Abiram, as Abner for Abiner, and Ahab for Ahiab." But surely this last passage is criticism gone mad, and utterly unworthy of the name of exact scholarship. It has, however, one excellent result. We are shocked at its recklessness, but we treat it with utter disdain, and refuse to be affrighted at its unparalleled audacity. No one can believe that "the Ark of the Covenant no doubt arose by a change of meaning out of the old idol," and that "it was a standard adapted primarily to the requirements of a wandering and warlike life." Nor will many be convinced by mere assertion, that "Jehovah ('God of the thunderstorm or the like') is to be regarded as having originally been a family or tribal God, either of the family to which Moses belonged, or of the tribe of Joseph. Jehovah was only a special name of El, which had become current within a powerful circle, and which, on that account, was all the more fitted to become the designation of a national God," and "is derived, in a certain sense, from the older deity of Sinai." Nor will the conjecture "that the verb of which Torah is the abstract, means originally to throw the lot arrows," commend itself to our sober judgment. In fact, as we have read this criticism, we have been often reminded of the throwing of arrows referred to in the Book of Proverbs to the madman, who scatters with them firebrands and death.

But the pious reader will be not less shocked to find that "it is extremely doubtful whether the actual monotheism which is undoubtedly pre-supposed in the universal moral precepts of the Decalogue would have formed the foundation of a national religion. It was first developed out of the national religion at the downfall of the nation, and thereupon kept its hold upon the people in an artificial manner, by means of the idea of a covenant formed by the God of the universe with, in the first instance, Israel alone."[1] In accordance with this, the same author tells us in a manner truly characteristic of his assumptions, "If there were stones in 'the Ark of the Covenant' at all, they probably served some other purpose than that of writing materials, otherwise they would not have been hidden as a mystery in the darkness of the sanctuary; they must have been exposed to public view. . . . . It results from this

[1] Wellhausen, Art. "Israel," *Encycl. Brit.*

that there was no real or certain knowledge as to what stood on the tables, and further, that if there were such stones in the Ark—and probably there were—there was nothing written on them.[1]" It is well to warn those who are tempted to follow these guides that hereafter they will be numbered amongst those "who falling down, looked up for heaven, and only saw the mist."

This brings us to another point, on which we would be very emphatic. In reading these theories we must never forget the old caution, "Verify your references." Many and many an argument advanced by these critics with a jaunty air would never deceive the most unwary, if the passages referred to in the footnotes were quoted at length in the body of the text with sufficiency of context. An example of this occurs very early in the dissertation on sacrifice. It is part of the theory to prove an evolution of ritual from chaotic and idolatrous orgies to the worship as we find it in the Pentateuch ritual.[2] In the course of this dissertation we find the following astounding statement:

> That perfect propriety was not always observed might be taken for granted, and is proved by Isaiah xxviii. 8, even with regard to the Temple of Jerusalem: "All tables are full of vomit; there is no room."

If the reader will turn to the passage quoted, he will see that there is not a word concerning the Temple of Jerusalem, but that it is a declaration of woe against "the crown of pride, the drunkards of Ephraim." One more example from the same section may be sufficient for the present:

> The ancient offerings [writes Wellhausen] were wholly of a joyous nature—a merrymaking before Jehovah with music and song, timbrels, flutes, and stringed instruments (Hos. ix. 1 *et seq.*; Amos v. 23; viii. 3; Isa. xxx. 32). No greater contrast could be conceived than the monotonous seriousness of the so-called Mosaic worship. Νόμος παρεισῆλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα.[3]

The passage from Isaiah is thus rendered in the Revised Version: "Through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be broken in pieces, which smote with a rod. And every stroke of the appointed staff which the Lord shall lay upon him shall be with tabrets and harps; and in battles of shaking will he fight with them." It would puzzle the most acute criticism to found any inference as to the joyousness of early Hebrew offerings in the problematic allusion to the wave-

---

[1] "Proleg.," p. 393. An instructive lesson may be learnt as to the position and value of the Ten Commandments by comparing the estimate of Wellhausen with the eloquent comment of Kalisch on Exodus xx. and xxxiv.

[2] "Proleg.," p. 433.

[3] "Proleg.," p. 81.

offering (tenufah) in this verse.[1] Hosea ix. 1 *et seq.* seems equally beside the mark. The context charges Israel with the crime of "forgetting his Maker and building temples," and proceeds, "Rejoice not, O Israel, for joy, as other people, for thou hast gone a whoring from thy God." It then denounces as a punishment, "Their sacrifices shall be unto them as the bread of mourners," and asks, "What will ye do in the solemn day and in the day of the feast of the Lord?" But if this can be used to show that the character of the worship that the pious Israelite deemed fit to be offered to the Lord altered so greatly in the course of time, the answer is at hand. It is exactly the language used by the so-called Deuteronomist (Deut. xxviii. 47): "Because thou servedst not the Lord thy God with joyfulness and gladness of heart for the abundance of all things, therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies which the Lord shall send against thee, in hunger and in thirst and in nakedness, and in want of all things." In a similar way in the passages in Amos the destruction of the joyous character of the service is declared to be a great punishment. The first text reads: "Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs, for I will not hear the melody of thy viols." The second declares, "The songs of the temple" (or, as many render, "palace") "shall be howlings in that day." Can we conceive, we may ask, a greater contrast than this to the picture of the great festivals of the Jewish Church as drawn by post-exilic writers? Thus we find the whole string of references utterly irrelevant; and though we are far from saying this is always the case, yet too frequently the reference cannot bear the weight of argument that rests upon it. Nor can we take the critic's passing reference as a proof for his statement, or we should believe that "Moses himself is said to have made a brazen image which down to Hezekiah's time continued to be worshipped at *Jerusalem as an image of Jehovah.*"[2] This throwing in most important statements as *obiter dicta* is a great trick of the new critics, and one has constantly to be on his guard against it. We subjoin a most characteristic passage, that those who are unacquainted with this literature may learn on what *feeble bases the most momentous* conclusions are made to rest. Wellhausen is treating of the oral and written Torah, and thus writes: "Just as it is in evidence that Deuteronomy became known in 621, and that it was unknown up to that date, so it is in evidence that the remaining Torah of the Pentateuch—for there is no doubt the law of Ezra was the

[1] The same word occurs in Isa. xix. 26, to describe the shaking of the Lord's hand over Egypt; and there is no reason whatever for believing the expression is anything but "tumultuous battles."

[2] Wellhausen, Art. "Israel," *Encycl. Brit.*

whole Pentateuch—became known in the year 444, and was unknown till then. This shows, in the first place, and puts it beyond question, that Deuteronomy is the first, and the priestly Torah the second, stage of the legislation."[1] It is this method of assertion that enables him to conclude this paragraph in this peremptory style: "It would require very strong internal evidence to destroy the probability, thus based on a most positive statement of facts, that the codification of the ritual only took place in the post-exile period." No one can account for the conclusions of this school until he has mastered the method.

We may now follow the process of disintegration, falsely called analysis, as it is applied to the Pentateuch, only premising that there is by no means absolute unanimity among the critics as to the different portions to be assigned to each document, and that the latest theories are adopted because serious flaws have been discovered in the previous suppositions.[2] Considerable acuteness, however, is shown in selecting the point of attack. It is thus opened by Wellhausen: "The Five Books of Moses and the Book of Joshua constitute one whole . . . . Out of this whole, the Book of Deuteronomy, as essentially an independent law-book, admits of being separated most easily;"[3] "and accordingly its independence was very early recognised . . . . The very name of Deuteronomy shows that from the earliest times it has been recognised as at least possessing a relative independence; the only difficulty is to determine where this section of the Pentateuch begins and ends. In recent times opinion has inclined more and more to the judgment of Hobbes and Vater, that the original Deuteronomy must be limited to the laws in chaps. xii.-xxvi. . . . . Some attempts to date Deuteronomy before the time of Josiah, in the reign of Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 4, 22), or even still earlier; but on the whole the date originally assigned by De Wette has held its ground. That the author of Deuteronomy had the Jehovistic work before him is also admitted, and it is pretty well agreed that the latter is referred to the golden age of Hebrew literature—the age of the kings and prophets before the dissolution of the sister-states of Israel and Judah."[4]

Let us suppose that in some remote period—say of one thousand years from the present date—a critic were to take

---

[1] "Proleg.," p. 408.

[2] For a condensed but very lucid statement of these theories, and a comparison between them, the reader is referred to Herzog's *Encyclopædia*, Art. "Pentateuch;" and for a more extended statement and refutation to Dr. Bissell's work on the "Origin and Structure of the Pentateuch."

[3] "Proleg.," p. 6. [4] Art. "Pentateuch," *Encycl. Brit.*

up Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," and subject it to similar processes. He would at once attack the celebrated fifteenth and sixteenth chapters "as essentially an independent" essay on Christianity, and admitting of being "most easily separated from the rest of the work." He might allege that the last sentence but one in the fourteenth chapter dealt with the resignation of Licinius, and the seventeenth chapter began with the words, "The unfortunate Licinius was the last rival who opposed the greatness, and the last captive who adorned the triumph, of Constantine;" plainly showing that the intermediate matter was an interpolation that did credit to English "acuteness." He might proceed to fortify this position by showing that the affairs of the Christian Church, when they came naturally in the way, were treated by the real Gibbon in chronological order and without violence to his history. The language of these chapters, too, he might allege was unlike Gibbon, especially the use of the word "obtrude," and the frequent repetition in them of the word "melancholy." The writer of these chapters had evidently suffered redaction at the hands of some unknown author, for he uses, concerning Cyprian, the most fluctuating language, at one time speaking of him as "the zealous, the eloquent, the ambitious," at another saying that "an account of his behaviour was published for the edification of the Christian world;" that he "pleaded with modest confidence;" that he was a man of "extreme caution" yet "vehement declamation" and "imperious declamation." In one sentence "the patriotism" of the inferior clergy is praised in opposing the pretension of the bishops, and their overthrow ascribed to Cyprian, "who would reconcile the acts of the most ambitious statesman with the Christian virtues which seemed adapted to the character of a saint;" yet this prelate is subsequently called "patriotic," plainly showing the influence, as our critics say, of a "priestly tendency" in the redactor. In chap. xv. it is said that "the memorable distinction of the laity and clergy was unknown to the Greeks and Romans," while in chap. xx. we find that "the distinction was familiar to many nations of antiquity," and a Greek author is quoted for the information in the text. In chap. xv. it is said, "the public functions of religion were *solely* entrusted to the established ministers of the Church, *the bishops and presbyters;*" but in chap. xx. we read, "in the Christian Church, which entrusts the service of the altar to a perpetual succession of consecrated ministers, the monarch, whose spiritual rank is less honourable than that of the meanest deacon, was seated below the rails of the sanctuary;" which evidently implied that some part of the "public functions of religion" was entrusted to deacons, who are not the same as

the ministers of the first passage. Similarly the language as to Christianity fluctuates. At one time it is praised as "pure and simple," and at another every scandalous story is repeated against it. But to maintain that these discrepancies proved the non-Gibbon character of the chapters would only enter into the mind of a man fresh from an analysis of the Pentateuch on the Graf-Wellhausen methods—an analysis that produces such results as these inspires doubt and not conviction.

Let us now take the Book of Deuteronomy in our hands and read it carefully through. It does not convey the impression of a law-book, but of a series of speeches upon matters of history, duty, and civil and religious obligations. "It would," says Bissell, "surprise one unacquainted with the subject to know how large a portion of the book is put directly into the mouth of the lawgiver, and is represented to be spoken by him. . . . Out of nearly a thousand verses there are but about sixty that are not in the form of direct address—that is, that do not purport to be the word for word utterances of Moses himself. If the first thirty chapters be taken by themselves, the relative disproportion is much more marked; the average of introductory or explanatory material to what remains being only about that of a single verse to a chapter."[1]

The new criticism affirms that the original Deuteronomy begins at chap. xii., with these words: "These are the statutes and the judgments, which ye shall observe to do in the land which the Lord, the God of thy fathers, hath given thee to possess it;" and ends, "that thou mayest be an holy people unto the Lord thy God, as He hath spoken." But is there any conceivable reason why they should begin here rather than iv. 1, "And now, O Israel, hearken unto the statutes and unto the judgments which I teach you for to do them," or end at the conclusion of the twenty-ninth chapter? There is no particle of external evidence that such a mutilated edition ever existed; there is no difference of idiom or of words that recommends this carving out a portion of the book and styling it the original document. It is purely and absolutely an arbitrary proceeding. Nor do the contents of this book allow us to attribute it to a different stratum of ritual and practice, to adopt Wellhausen's favourite expression, from the remainder of the Pentateuch. In calling this an arbitrary method of criticism, we bear in mind Wellhausen's statement: "The Deuteronomic legislation begins just like the Book of the Covenant, with a law for the place of worship. But now there is a complete change: Jehovah is to be worshipped only in

[1] Bissell, p. 259.

Jerusalem (*sic*), and nowhere else. The new law-book is never weary of repeating this command. . . . All is directed against current usage, against 'what we are accustomed to do at this day;' the law is polemical, and aims at reformation. This law, therefore, belongs to the second period of the history, the time when the party in Jerusalem was attacking the high places. When we read, then, that King Josiah was moved to destroy the local sanctuaries by the discovery of a law-book, this book, assuming it to be preserved in the Pentateuch, can be none other than the legislative part of Deuteronomy, which must once have had a separate existence in a shorter form than the present Book of Deuteronomy; this, too, is the inference to which we are led by the citations and references in Kings and Jeremiah." [1]

It is noteworthy that Jerusalem is never mentioned in Deuteronomy, only the ambiguous "place which the Lord thy God shall choose to put His name there." The assumptions, too, are simply astounding, and are such as would never be allowed for a moment were we investigating the age of the Rig Veda instead of the composition of the Pentateuch.

The old view of Deuteronomy was that it contained an authoritative revision of former legislation, both expanding its scope and contenting itself with brief allusion to the priestly ritual, and dealing with many questions in a hortatory style. It was allowed that a few verses stood in the text that in modern works would have been relegated to foot-notes, but in so ancient a document it was admitted that they might have assumed their present position. The "Song of Moses" presented so many archaic forms and was of so peculiar a character as to be allowed a unique position, and on its language and methods of expression critical ingenuity was permitted to expend itself, on condition that it left the authentic character of the composition intact. This, however, is all changed, and having been arbitrarily treated, Deuteronomy is exalted into a separate document, D; and it is eagerly searched to find differences between its statements and those of other portions of the Pentateuch, torn from their connection in just as arbitrary a manner, and accused of interpolation or mutilation if they offer any obstacle to the will of the theorist.[2]

---

[1] Art. "Pentateuch," *Encycl. Brit.*

[2] For an example of this let the reader carefully peruse the subjoined passage, p. 370 of the "Prolegomena": "Nöldeke finds, it is true, a reminiscence of the priestly code in the ark of acacia wood, Deut. x. 1; but the ark is here spoken of in a connection which answers exactly to that of the Jehovist (Exod. xxxii. and xxxiii.), and is quite inconsistent with the PC (Exod. xxxv. *et seq.*). . . . True, the ark is not mentioned in JE (Exod. xxxiii.) as we now have it, but in the next Jehovistic piece (Num. x. 33) it suddenly appears; and there must have been some state-

But this hypothesis, even were it accepted, leaves too many difficulties unexplained, and raises fresh ones that cannot easily have a solution within the limits imposed by the hypothesis. Some one must have written the original short recension, and for a purpose. If written in the interests of a purer faith and practice than then prevailed, why was the air of antiquity assumed and so perfectly maintained? Can a parallel to this be found anywhere of a writer forgetting his own country and his father's house, and projecting himself into a dim past into which he does not allow a ray of the present to penetrate? How is it that the writer of the longer recension encumbered himself with the fiction of a personal Moses, and put into his mouth statements that were utterly untrustworthy? and how is it that he, too, maintained this air of antiquity with so perfect a disguise that it imposed upon everyone until the modern era of criticism? How, further, can we imagine these different editors inventing the sublime and composite character of Moses, and meeting one another with imperturbable countenances as they build up the ever-lengthening myth, and no one to be smitten with the passion of discovering and denouncing his views? Above all, what is the morality of men that conceived of God as forbidding them to bear false witness against their neighbours, but accepting their unworthy artifices when they bore false witness against Himself?

The attempt to disparage the historical value of Deuteronomy cannot be understood unless we follow the criticism in its search after another stratum in the Pentateuch of legislation and history. It finds one embedded in the so-called Priestly Code. "This too, like Deuteronomy, is a law-book. . . Its main stock is Leviticus, with the cognate part of the adjacent books, Exod. xxv.-xl. (except chaps. xxxii.-xxxiv.), etc. The legal contents of the code are supported on a scaffolding of history." Again we protest there is not the faintest shadow of proof that such a document ever existed as the Priestly Code.

---

ment in the work as to how it came there. The tabernacle also appears ready set up in xxxiii. 7, without any foregoing account of its erection. The institution of the ark, as well as the erection of the tabernacle, must have been narrated between xxxiii. 6, 7, and then omitted by the present editor of the Pentateuch, from the necessity of paying some regard to 2 Exod. xxv. That this is the case, many other considerations also tend to prove." The assumptions here are of the usual character, confirming the impression that is soon made upon one in reading this style of comment, that such writers and such documents as they require for their hypotheses never existed in this world, and never will. Nor does the critic content himself with attributing strange actions to his fellows. He thus unfolds the Divine counsels: "By making an image the Israelites showed that they could not do without a sensible representation of the Deity, and Jehovah therefore gave them the ark instead of the calf."

Its central position, its enlargement, its differentiation from other documents, are all matters of subjective criticism, on which the most diverse opinions are advanced by men equally competent to decide. It would lead us far beyond all limits to follow the analysis of the Priestly Code at length, but we may be allowed to put before our readers one or two difficulties. According to Wellhausen, the Priestly Code writes thus about the Sabbath: "Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you; everyone that defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people" (Exod. xxxi. 14). But why is it not part of the Priestly Code in Deut. v. 12, "Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee"? and why is "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy" (Exod. xx. 8) put over to JE? Why in Gen. xiii. should verse 6, 11b, and 12 alone belong to PC, and all the rest to JE? Again, why is Gen. xxvii. 46, xxviii. 9, a portion of the Priestly Code, and xxviii. 10 a portion of JE? or why should the verse, "And Rachel died and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem," be assigned to JE in Gen. xxxv. 19, but the verse, "But as for me, when I came from Padan, Rachel died by me in the land of Canaan in the way, when yet there was but a little way to come unto Ephrath, the same is Bethlehem," in Gen. xlviii. 7, belong to the Priestly Code? It is sufficient for our purpose to adopt the finding of Green in Herzog's *Encyclopædia*, English edition: "The criteria of this proposed analysis are so subtle, not to say mechanical, in their nature, so many conjectural assumptions are involved, and there is such an entire absence of external corroborative testimony, that no reliance can be placed in its conclusions where these conflict with statements of the history itself." We may add that it is so shifting in its conclusions as it is pushed by its adversaries that it rivals the chameleon in changing its appearance to avoid danger. When the criticism we are considering has obtained its documents, arranged them, and taken care to have the influence of the redactor working through all, so that at the last resort any stubborn passage may be eliminated as an evident interpolation, violence is further done to them, and they are made to testify to different strata of practice and ritual. These differences fall under distinct heads. One set affect the place of worship; another show different developments of sacrificial rites; another deal in the same way with the sacred feasts; another with the duties of the priests and their endowments. Here is one great charm of the theory. It introduces development into religion; but it forgets the kindred doctrine of degradation, and endeavours to win adherents by false hopes

of explaining the existence of the doctrines of revelation on naturalistic grounds. We purpose, therefore, to examine the new theory on the alleged discrepancies in the codes as to the place of worship.

It is alleged that "from the earliest period of the history of Israel, all that precedes the building of the Temple, not a trace can be found of any sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy."[1] This result is obtained by skilfully avoiding the point in dispute. It is not maintained that a central sanctuary and altar were established by Moses which, during the conquest and times of the Judges *de facto*, absorbed all the religious feeling and practices of the time. These were objects of ideal legislation, and were only brought within the sphere of practical religion by the erection of Solomon's Temple, which gave a dignified and fitting example of what the Temple of Jehovah should be in the midst of His people. That this is not a modern theory invented under the pressure of adverse arguments is admitted by Wellhausen, although he strongly condemns the originator of it. "The author of the Book of Kings," he writes, "views the Temple of Solomon as a work undertaken exclusively in the interests of pure worship, and as differing entirely in origin from the sacred buildings of the kings of Israel, with which accordingly it is not compared, but contrasted as the genuine is contrasted with the spurious. It is in its nature unique, and from the outset had the design of setting aside all other holy places—a religious design independent of and unconnected with politics. This view, however, is unhistorical; it carries back to the original date of the Temple, and imports into the purpose of its foundation the significance it had acquired in Judah shortly before the exile."[2] We may add that to complete the whole *bouleversement* of our ideas, we are taught to regard all the so-called history of the Jews as a manufactured article assuming its present form under the influence of various redactors. Those who believe the legislation preceded the history have their fatuity thus exhibited to them. "The great antiquity of the priestly legislation is proved by relegating it to an historical sphere, created by itself out of its own legal premises, but is nowhere to be found within, and therefore must have preceded actual history. Thus (so to speak) it holds itself up in the air by its own waistband."[3]

The conclusions of the new criticism about the place of worship are drawn from comparisons between the different

---

[1] "Proleg.," p. 17. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 21.
[3] "Proleg.," p. 39.

documents it has arbitrarily created; and we hope to show that they are utterly baseless. The opposition is thus drawn out by Wellhausen:

> The main Jehovistic law (he says), the so-called Book of the Covenant, contains (Exod. xx. 24-26) the following ordinance: "An altar of earth shalt thou make unto Me, and thereon shalt thou sacrifice thy burnt offerings and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen; in every place where I cause My name to be honoured will I come unto thee and will bless thee. Or if thou wilt make Me an altar of stones, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones, for if thou hast lifted up thy tool upon it thou hast polluted it. And thou shalt not go up to Mine altar by steps, that thy nakedness be not discovered before it." Unquestionably it is not the altar of the tabernacle, which was made of wood and plated over with brass, nor that of Solomon's Temple . . . that is here described as the true one. On the other hand, it is obvious that a multiplicity of altars is not merely regarded as permissible, but assumed as a matter of course. For no stress at all is laid upon having always the same sacrificial seat, whether fixed or to be moved about from place to place; earth and unhewn stones of the field can be found everywhere, and such an altar falls to pieces just as readily as it is built. A choice of two kinds of material is also given, which surely implies that the Lawgiver thought of more than one altar; and not at *the* place, but at *every* place where He causes His name to be honoured will Jehovah come to His worshippers and bless them. Thus the law now under consideration is in harmony with the custom and usage of the first historical period—has its root therein and gives its sanction to it. Certainly the liberty to sacrifice everywhere seems to be somewhat restricted by the added clause, "in every place where I cause My name to be honoured." But this means nothing more than that the spots where intercourse between earth and heaven took place were not willingly regarded as arbitrarily chosen, but, on the contrary, were considered as having been somehow or other (!) selected by the Deity Himself for His service.[1]

But surely the passage in itself cannot bear the interpretation put upon it. It simply restricts the place of sacrifice to the site chosen by God. It has nothing to do with the number of such places. The tabernacle was not yet in existence; when it came into existence it would come under this law, and the usual explanation is quite as good as this newer one, viz., that the place chosen afterwards was first the tabernacle—or, at any rate, before the Ark—and afterwards the Solomonic Temple. That this passage, which speaks after all of only one altar, does refer to some well-known spot is supported by the command, in Exod. xxiii. 14 *et seq.*, for all the males to appear three times a year before God. It is not absolutely correct to say that "JE sanctions a multiplicity of altars," and to appeal to the patriarchal history in confirmation of the idea. That history deals with a different sort of religious life, the family life. The legislation of the Jews was for a nation which, according to the orthodox theory, was to be fashioned ulti-

[1] "Proleg.," pp. 29, 30.

mately to an actual unity of worship and faith through slowly evolving periods of history."[1]

The opposition between JE and D is thus declared by Wellhausen to be emphatic and material: "The Deuteronomic legislation begins (Deut. xii.) just like the Book of the Covenant, with a law for the place of worship. But now there is a complete change; Jehovah is to be worshipped only in Jerusalem and nowhere else." We have already drawn attention to the subtle error of Wellhausen, substituting Jerusalem for the vague phrase "the place which the Lord your God shall choose," and repeat the remark not to charge him with intentional deceit, but simply to show how naturally a writer lets fall a phrase that fixes his date, and how exceedingly able those ancient scribes must have been who imposed for so many generations on unwary readers with the local colour of the wilderness. We wish particularly to press the objection to its reception that this supposed discrepancy between JE and D must have presented at first, if the theory of its origin now under consideration were true. It was first discovered, we are asked to believe, under King Josiah, and instantly converted into a means of reformation under that king. Before that date it had been unknown. Was there no one amongst the old party to reply that the new document contained laws hitherto unknown amongst them, and contrary to what had been in force from the earliest time? Can we suppose that one, who on the supposition clearly foresaw and forestalled so many objections, allowed this discrepancy to remain on the face of the documents; and were all the nation so slow of perception that none resisted the assumption built on so strangely novel a document?

But we should deny any discrepancy between Exod. xx. 24-26 and Deut. xii. 5 to 14. The law that was sufficient in the wilderness would not be sufficient in the altered circumstances of the settled habitation in Canaan. It was forty years since it had been promulgated and acted upon by the representatives of the congregation, if not by all its individuals. But now the opportunities for idolatry and the inducements to it

[1] This would allow us to consider the "Book of the Covenant" to be a collection of traditional rules handed down from earliest times, and receiving the sanction of Moses. "These must have been old and accepted rules for the building of altars, and they are not inconsistent with the directions for the construction of the altar of the court of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvii. 1-8). There is no good reason to doubt that they were observed in the 'brazen altar,' as it is called, although no reference is made to them in connection with it. That altar, according to the directions that are given, must indeed have been rather an *altar case*, with a mass of earth or stone within, when it was put to use."—"Speaker's Commentary," *loc. cit.*; also Kalisch.

would be vastly multiplied, and it was absolutely necessary to secure an immunity from fancy rituals. This was secured by limiting sacrifice to the "place which the Lord shall choose;" and though it may please our modern critic to say that "by this only the capital of Judah can be meant," yet Jeremiah calls Shiloh "the place where God set His name at the first," and the Lawgiver was, we believe, ignorant of Jerusalem, as far as its future place in the history of Israel was concerned. And further, Moses distinctly orders that an altar should be built and sacrifices offered on Ebal, which at least shows that he did not consider it improper to build altars elsewhere than at Jerusalem.[1] In fact, the discrepancy between the two documents is one that is manufactured by the critics, and any apparent differences may easily be reconciled.

We are told that "the Priestly Code presupposes unity of worship, and transfers it, by means of the tabernacle, to primitive times." The Priestly Code rests upon the result which is only the aim of Deuteronomy. Everywhere unity of worship is tacitly assumed as a fundamental postulate, but nowhere does it find actual expression.[2] We would remind our readers that according to Wellhausen's theory the Priestly Code was composed in "the third post-exilian period of the history of the cultus," and that "it is proved that the tabernacle rests on an historical fiction," "and it is the copy, not the prototype, of the Temple at Jerusalem." We are, therefore, to admit that the Priestly Code is the successor of Deuteronomy. It has been held by many acute critics that the Priestly Code is the most ancient part of the Pentateuch, and certainly the idea of strictness of service at one central place culminates in D. But there is no valid ground for seeing growth in this matter, and it matters very little whether JE+PC+D, or JE+D+PC= Pentateuch, as far as development goes; but the old order is historically correct. Again we call attention to the curious way in which documents are dealt with in this theory. Nowhere, we are told, does unity of worship find expression in PC. We instinctively turn to Lev. xvii. 8, and read, "Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers which sojourn among you that offereth a burnt offering or sacrifice, and bring it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation to offer it unto the Lord, even that man shall be cut off from his people." But a couple of lines of print in the "Prolegomena" disposes of this objection—"the

[1] Deut. xxvii. 4-8. Of course if this is a post-exilic passage the argument from it falls to the ground; but this is the difficulty of contending with its statements: it can do what it will with its authorities. For a full and able note on Deut. xii. 4-15, see the "Speaker's Commentary."

[2] "Proleg.," p. 35 *et passim*.

small body of legislation, Lev. xvii.-xxvi., is the transition from Deuteronomy to the Priestly Code." It does not follow without exception that PC rests upon the idea of a state in which all ritual is a settled thing, for the story, as told in Numbers, which is put into this code by the critics, brings out a state anything but settled as to worship and its auxiliaries.

On this branch of the subject we think we have adduced sufficient evidence that the three strata of cultus and legislation are due to the dream of the critic, and can adopt the words of Wellhausen, with a slight difference of application—"A law so living, which stands at every point in immediate contact with reality . . . . . and which proceeds with constant reference to the demands of practical life, is no mere velleity, no mere cobweb of an idle brain," but is, as we have always been led to believe, the work of Moses, who was faithful in all his house. The other chief branches of objection are equally weak, and if carefully followed out in detail refuse to bear the interpretation put upon them.

FREDK. E. TOYNE.

Correspondence.

"THE HOUR OF COMMUNION."

To the Editor of "THE CHURCHMAN."

SIR,—Able and candid as is the article of Mr. Dimock in your last, I think he has exceeded greatly in his estimation of the force of two authorities, alleged by him in favour of non-fasting Communion—the *Teaching of the Apostles* and *St. Ignatius.*

These, he says, are "perhaps the most important witnesses in this matter," and, of the former, "it represents a state of things in the Church, or some portion of it, in which post-prandial or post-cœnal Communion was the ordinary rule and practice;" and "we see a scene of post-Apostolic times, and . . . the Eucharist partaken of by Christians (*sic*) after being *filled* with a repast (or as part of a repast) . . . which none will maintain to have been the meal of the morning."

I note that a *morning* meal would be no more allowed, in a question of fasting Communion, than one in the evening; but there is really *no* note of time in the Διδαχή, and so the whole of its two chapters—ix. and x.—*may* even be read of an *early* Communion.

But the force of the example, upon which so confident a conclusion is made to rest, is wholly in the words, Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι, of which I will only remark that more than one interpretation is allowable (Rom. xv. 24), even though the words were in no special connection with their context; but in the Διδαχή they are in an indissoluble connection, which, I think, determines absolutely their special reference, and that is to the Eucharist, and not to any other "eating" whatever. The previous chapter contains the direction as to the "Eucharist," and this includes the Bread *broken* (κλάσμα), and forbids anyone to "eat or drink of the