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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

The leaders of the Indian Christian Church are well aware that if this movement grows to what they hope for it will overwhelm them. At the same time they are resolved that before they appeal for the help from the older churches that they will assuredly need they must first arouse their own churches to face the situation and to set themselves in faith and courage to a task that is primarily their concern. That they are now engaged in securing. A challenge as gigantic as that which God may be preparing for the young Indian Church might well overwhelm it, were its resources only in itself. The missionaries who have had a share in the building up of the Church in India during the past fifty years, and some of whom have had experience of mass movements, can see many errors and failures in their service as they look back. The guidance of those who have come up from slavery, and especially their guidance when they come in their battalions, so ignorant and so beset with a multitude of needs, requires the possession of gifts such as few possess by nature and of graces that we are often slow to seek. For that reason those to whom this great opportunity and responsibility seems to be coming, Indian and foreigner alike, need and ask from us our sympathy, a sympathy which can only come from informed and deeply interested minds, and they ask also the support of our prayers which cannot be offered worthily unless they proceed from such sympathy and such knowledge.

The Conference of British Missionary Societies, which is keeping in close touch with this movement and which has received a deeply interesting report on it from the Reverend William Paton of the International Missionary Council, has issued a call to prayer, which should find a response in all Christian hearts. They do so, they say, because this situation can only be faced by the Christian forces acting on a common plan with perfect mutual trust and belief in one another and all together in God. We are invited to have before us the following urgent needs:

1. That the depressed classes, sheep without a shepherd, may be drawn into the fold of Christ, in whom is their only hope.

2. That their leaders may be rightly guided by the Holy Spirit to seek spiritual answers in Christ for the deep spiritual need of their people.

3. That the churches in India may be drawn into new unity and fellowship, and that thus all their resources may be set free for the great tasks of evangelism and caring for the multitudes.

4. That the life of the churches at home may be quickened, so that they may perceive the working of God's Spirit in the movement in India; that they may be ready to answer His call, and make available for His service those additional gifts of life and of money which are so urgently needed.

Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems.

IX. Problems of the Pentateuch.

By the Reverend Canon J. Battersby Harford, D.D., Ripon.

Two questions have been raised in recent years with regard to the Pentateuch. The first in order of thought is that which has been raised afresh by Professors Volz of Tübingen and Rudolph of Giessen: Is there an Elohist at all and, if there is, what was the nature of his work? The second is that which has been raised by Emeritus Professor Welch and which has been treated by him in a succession of works on Deuteronomy: What is its date and what, if any, is its relation to the Northern Kingdom?

It is obvious that these two problems can only be dealt with very briefly, but the writer trusts that his treatment of them will, so far as it goes, be just and fair.

I. Is there an Elohist at all?

As early as 1798 Ilgen pointed to duplicate narratives and distinct vocabularies within the Elohistic portions of Genesis. Hupfeld in 1853, working independently, argued cogently for the existence of two writers who used Elohim in preference to Yahweh, while he also showed how closely related one of them was to the Yahwistic writer, so much so that they were in his opinion combined (= JE) before being attached to P and D. His argument has been accepted and built upon by

a whole series of scholars ever since. But now Professor Volz in his recent treatise writes: What I aim at is the exposition and the proof of the view that in Genesis we have before us, apart from P, one single narrator, the Yahwist; that, in particular, the so-called Elohist was not an independent writer; that, if he existed at all, he was at most the author of a new edition, and that whether he was an Elohistic or a Deuteronomic editor, he only added certain sections for the edification of a later age.

The question thus raised is not an easy one to answer. As the editors of the Oxford *Hexateuch* put it nearly forty years ago: If we accept the theory of two independent narrators, 'the two forms of the tradition exhibit so many common features of style and expression that their discrimination is often difficult; much uncertainty must frequently attach to the partition; and that, even when there can be no doubt that the narrative is composite, in consequence of the presence of conflicting detail, the allotment of the several passages can only claim varying degrees of probability. In many cases, therefore, the analysis of E out of JE cannot attain the security with which P may be separated from the total product PJE. Yet it will be found on examination that this uncertainty only affects the items of less importance; the main contents and character of the document can be determined with sufficient clearness.'[1] If we look at the passages assigned in this edition to the Elohist in Gn 1 to Ex 3^{15}, we find 48 uses of Elohim as a proper name, and twelve cases in which it occurs in the phrases, 'the fear, the angel (3), or the angels (1), the house (2), the host, the Spirit, the face of God,' and 'in the stead of God' (2). This use of Elohim begins at ch. 20 and occurs later in other fifteen chapters. On the other hand, Yahweh as the divine name is used in Gn 1 to Ex 3^{15}, 146 times. How are we to account for the sudden emergence of the name Elohim in Gn 20 to Ex 3^{15}, and for the equally rare use of the same after Ex 3^{15} (only 27 times in JE)? Something definite is required to account for these changes. What is it?

The great majority of scholars have found the explanation to be that, alongside J, a second narrator comes in who, like P, believes that the name Yahweh was only revealed to the Children of Israel at the time of Moses, and who therefore, up to that time, uses the name Elohim as the proper name. Volz, however, declares that two parallel narratives are very unlikely, and that their relationship is very difficult to explain. As a matter of fact, Yahweh occurs twice in $15^{1.2}$ and once in 22^{11} in supposed E passages. The Yahwist uses Elohim sometimes when he wishes to speak not of the God of Israel in particular, but of the divine existence and character in general (as Gn 28^{17-22}), when he refers to cult-places such as Beth-el and Penu-el, and when the speech is with foreigners (as Gn 31^{42} and in the Joseph-story 41^{16}, etc.). This last point is fully shared by the other side, but these cases are comparatively few in number. Moreover, we no longer have the complete document E before us. Frequently only fragments remain, and 'it has undergone transpositions and curtailments, which place its original form beyond our reach, but its chief affinities can still be traced.'[2]

E affirms that the forefathers of Israel 'beyond the River' were idolators (Jos 24^{2}, Gn 35^{2-4} and 31^{19}), whereas J seems to regard the worship of Yahweh as primæval (Gn 4^{26}) and as common to Jacob and Laban (31^{49}). E is less anthropomorphic than J in his account of divine communications. There is no personal wrestler (as J, Gn 32^{24-31}), no visit in human form to Abraham's tent (as J, ch. 18). God comes in vision (Gn 15^{1}) or in dream by night (20^{3}, etc.). He speaks by His angel from heaven (21^{17}, etc.) and by prophets (20^{7} 41^{38}, Ex 15^{20}, Nu 11^{25-30}). E has his own phrases. Horeb is his name for 'the Mount of God' (cf. D), contrast Sinai (Ex $19^{11b.c.}$ 34^{2-4}, etc.). Amorites are his designation of the original inhabitants of Canaan (13 times, contrast Canaanites). Much more might be added, but space forbids.

Volz replies that the one narrator is not to be tied down to one expression. He can say 'venison' *and* savoury meat in Gn 27, 'maidservant' *and* handmaid in Gn 29 and 30, etc. Horeb more probably comes from Deuteronomy than *vice versa*. Small repetitions may be merely postscripts as in the prophetic writings. In longer passages the same narrator may weave several 'motives' together or even combine originally distinct accounts of earlier stories. Moreover, some later editor may have added new versions more suitable for worship or instruction. E may have been the re-publisher, but was not an original narrator. He may, in some cases, have revised and rewritten. A member of the Deuteronomic School may have done this when the books were put into one collection.

These being the two theories, how do they work out in practice?

Let us take first ch. 20^{1-17} which the Oxford *Hexateuch* assigns to E. (i) It uses the name

[1] *The Hexateuch*, ed. J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby (1900), i. 110.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 112.

Jacob, and see 45^{28} 46^{1} $48^{11.\ 21}$), but as a rule the two names do still afford some guidance, although Rudolph gives it up as hopeless.

It will only be possible to give one example of the way in which Rudolph seeks to justify his refusal to believe in an independent narrator E. Let us take ch. 37. We cannot expect any solution to cover all the difficulties. It has passed through various editings and the editors did not always agree together. Rudolph's solution is that not the brethren but the Midianites sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites and that the latter brought him into Egypt. Apart from *vv.*[1] and [2ac], which are due to P, the rest of the chapter, he says, is Yahwistic and contains no contradictions; [5b], however, is to be struck out (with the LXX) and [8b] is to be placed after [10]; 'and to his brethren' really means 'as to his brethren,' [35f.] are to be read together and mean 'his father wept for him, whereas in reality the Midianites sold him into Egypt' (!); [36] the 'Midianites' sold him, *i.e.* through the Ishmaelites (39^{1})! The solution of the Oxford *Hexateuch* is that J told how the brethren sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites, while E told how the Midianites kidnapped him and carried him into Egypt. The difficulty is that no subject to the verbs in *v.*[28] is named. Ch. 40^{15}, 'I was stolen away,' is in favour of kidnapping, whereas 45^{4-5}, 'I am Joseph your brother, whom ye sold into Egypt, and be not angry with yourselves that ye sold me hither,' is in favour of J's story being taken as selling by the brethren, and only by special pleading can it be taken as meaning 'you meant to sell me, but you were anticipated by the Midianites.' *Vv.*[2bd. 3f. 12. 13a. 14b. 18b. 21. 25b-27. 28b. 32a. 33b. 35] seem to come from J's story and the rest from E.

The conclusion to which one comes after examining the whole series of chapters in Genesis is that, while it is always possible that in exceptional cases passages attributed to E are editorial rather than independent, yet, in the great majority of cases, E does contribute his own independent version of the stories, which have been handed down from the early days in the Northern Kingdom. This only becomes clearer when we carry the analysis through Exodus and Numbers.

But we must now turn to the second question which awaits our consideration. I much regret that it is impossible in the available space to do anything like justice to the closely reasoned and most able and attractively presented argument to be dealt with.

II. In 1924 Professor Welch launched on the world a theory of *The Code of Deuteronomy*, which laid down that that book was not written in favour of the concentration of worship at the central sanctuary, but was only adapted to that end at the last moment by the insertion of a new section (12^{1-7}) which for the first time ordered the centralization of the worship of Yahweh at a single sanctuary. [This first volume has been dealt with in *Since Wellhausen*, 92–117. In the main I adhere to the positions there taken up, and to it I must refer my readers. This will make it a little more possible to give attention to the remaining two volumes.]

In 1932 this was followed up by *Deuteronomy, the Framework to the Code*, in which he argues with remarkable force and real spiritual insight that the introductory and concluding chapters are in large measure the product of the Israelite community, which remained in the northern territory after the Fall of Samaria.

Now in 1935 he has published the Baird Lecture for 1934 under the title of *Post-Exilic Judaism*. In this book he aims at showing the part which Northern Israel took in preserving the religious life during the Exile, and how it was that the Judæan exiles after the Return declined to allow the Northerners to join in their reconstruction of worship.

If we are right in accepting, in Part I. of this article, the view that E was primarily a collection of stories of the early history of the nation as they had been handed down in Northern Israel, then we must carefully weigh the evidence which in Welch's opinion justifies him in saying that the references in the framework of the Code to the past traditions of the nation show in every case (except one) dependence on the distinctive traditions of E. (In this, Steuernagel agrees with Welch.) For this purpose we must postpone, as Welch does, the consideration of the historical introduction, and look at some of the introductory chapters. We will begin with ch. 5. The writer there refers to (1) the covenant at Horeb (5^{2}, cf. 9^{9-11} 10^{4}) based on the Decalogue. This was final and immutable. (2) Statutes and Judgments (5^{1} 5^{31}–6^{1} 11^{1}), *i.e.* the Code (12–26) which was to regulate their conduct in the Land of Promise. This was given at Beth-peor by Moses. It could not be immutable, for circumstances change. The men whom God would use to introduce modifications were the prophets (18^{9-22}). The prophets who first appeared with articulate messages were Elijah, Amos, Hosea (see Amos 2^{11} $3^{7.\ 8}$ 7^{10-17}). Their homes or spheres of action were in North Israel. The basis of ch. 5 seems to be in E (Ex $18^{2.\ 19-23}$ $19^{3.\ 17.\ 19}$ $20^{19.\ 21}$ $21^{6.\ 13}$ $22^{8.\ 9.\ 28}$ $24^{11.\ 14}$). After Ex 3, normally both J and E use Yahweh, but in ch. 18 Elohim, while naturally used in connexion with Jethro, yet

Elohim 6 times (contrast Yahweh in the editorial addition of $v.^{18}$, introduced to explain $v.^{17}$.

(ii) This is one of three narratives dealing with a common incident (cf. $v.^{5}$, 'she is my sister' with $12^{18f.}$ and 26^{7}). They cannot have all belonged to the same tradition. The first and third seem to belong to J, but the third, by its greater simplicity, appears to belong to an earlier stratum than the first. The story of Abram exhibits everything on a grander scale; 26^{1a} refers back to 12^{16-20}, but there is no allusion to 20^{1-17} E.

(iii) In ch. 20 the emphasis is not, as in $12^{10f. 14}$, on the beauty of Sarah (at the age of ninety according to P), but on the prophetic character of Abraham ($v.^{7}$). The divine warning is conveyed to Abimelech in a dream. Abraham, as a prophet, by his intercession brings healing to the King, his wife, and his household ($^{7. 17}$). Volz declares that this is not a distinct narrative, but a recasting of the other two passages to form a third in the interest of the moral monotheism of Israel. It shows a Deuteronomic tendency.

Take next 21^{8-21} (contrast $16^{1ff.}$). Volz applies the same solution. We have, he says, not an original narrator, but a recaster who has worked over the material of J. He retains the original J material which lay before him, but adds his own recasting, with the object, as in 20^{1-17}, to provide a parallel piece to J's narrative, which would be of value for instruction or for use in worship. 'Why he carried this through only very occasionally we cannot say.' So Volz, who adds that the representatives of the documentary theory also have no explanation of it; but is that so? One would have said that they did give an explanation which was both clear and satisfying. The editor who put together these passages from J and E preserved in that way traditions from both North and South Israel. Moreover, we must say that, if $21^{8ff.}$ be a recasting of $16^{1ff.}$, it is assuredly altered in every particular. In $16^{1ff.}$ Yahweh occurs 8 times, in 21 Elohim occurs 6 times. In 16 Hagar flees and her child is not yet born; in 21 Abraham sends her away, and the child (according to P) is fourteen years old. In 16 Hagar returns to her mistress; in 21 there is no return. The words for 'maidservant' are different in 16 and 21. According to Volz, 20^{1-17} and 21^{8-11} are the strongest supports of his thesis. If so, that thesis seems to be very weakly supported. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to accept the view that these two passages are merely a recasting of earlier stories with a moralizing tendency.

Let us pass on to 22^{1-19}. Verses $^{1-13}$ are generally assigned to E. Elohim occurs five times (probably originally six times if, as seems probable, the editor has changed 'angel of God' [$v.^{11}$] into 'angel of Yahweh' in preparation for the Yahwistic insertion of $vv.^{15-18}$, $v.^{14}$ being also an editorial insertion for the same reason). In the original story the name of the place may have been originally formed with El and later changed into a Yahwistic form. A later hand, who was familiar with the phraseology of J, probably added to E $vv.^{15-18}$. The solemn oath of Yahweh 'by himself' ($v.^{16}$) is only mentioned once elsewhere in a passage of similar expansion (Ex 32^{13}). 'Saith Yahweh' (lit. oracle of Yahweh) occurs again in the Pentateuch only in Nu 14^{28} and $24^{3. 15}$. But it is extremely frequent in the prophetic literature, *e.g.* Amos 2^{11}, Hos $2^{15\ (13)}$, Is 4^{2} (and 24 times) and especially in Jeremiah (156 times) and Ezekiel (86 times). Volz, however, contests altogether an independent narrative by E. He takes $^{14-18}$ as by the same narrator as $^{1-13}$, and thus can balance four 'Yahweh' against five 'Elohim,' but he gives no reason for this sudden change in the divine names, and the language of $^{15-18}$, as we have seen, seems distinctly later. The argument would seem to be decidedly in favour of the ascription of $^{1-13}$ to E.

So far we have considered two narratives, which are predominantly of one complexion (E or an editor). Let us now consider a passage in which the two writers according to most critics are intertwined, namely, ch. 15. Here Elohim is not used, but that there are two narratives combined is recognized by Volz. As the Oxford *Hexateuch* says, 'The phenomena of ch. 15 are extremely complex and intricate, and all critics recognize that the analysis must be regarded as only probable. The vision of $v.^{1}$ is presumably in the night, and in $v.^{5}$ Abram is brought forth to see the stars, but in $v.^{12}$ the sun has not yet set. Clearly two narratives are here combined.' Volz and the Oxford *Hexateuch* agree in regarding $^{1-6}$ and $^{7ff.}$ as independent narratives, one dealing with the promise of an heir, the other with the gift of the land. Taking first $vv.^{1-6}$, $v.^{3}$ seems to be a duplicate of $v.^{2}$. In $^{3. 4.}$ and ^{6} there is no statement as to the time of day, and 'Yahweh' in ^{6} suggests J, while $^{1-2}$ and ^{5} at night suggest E. Verse ^{7} may well be an editorial addition, as Volz says, connecting the two passages and replacing an original verse which gave an introduction and a divine name as the subject of the verb. Verses $^{9-11}$ and ^{17} seem to belong to the same story, but $^{12-16}$, according to the Oxford *Hexateuch* ($^{13-16}$ according to Volz), seem to have been added by a later writer (J 2). It is connected with another subject, namely, the Egyptian bondage. It seems

a whole series of scholars ever since. But now Professor Volz in his recent treatise writes: What I aim at is the exposition and the proof of the view that in Genesis we have before us, apart from P, one single narrator, the Yahwist; that, in particular, the so-called Elohist was not an independent writer; that, if he existed at all, he was at most the author of a new edition, and that whether he was an Elohistic or a Deuteronomic editor, he only added certain sections for the edification of a later age.

The question thus raised is not an easy one to answer. As the editors of the Oxford *Hexateuch* put it nearly forty years ago: If we accept the theory of two independent narrators, 'the two forms of the tradition exhibit so many common features of style and expression that their discrimination is often difficult; much uncertainty must frequently attach to the partition; and that, even when there can be no doubt that the narrative is composite, in consequence of the presence of conflicting detail, the allotment of the several passages can only claim varying degrees of probability. In many cases, therefore, the analysis of E out of JE cannot attain the security with which P may be separated from the total product PJE. Yet it will be found on examination that this uncertainty only affects the items of less importance; the main contents and character of the document can be determined with sufficient clearness.'[1] If we look at the passages assigned in this edition to the Elohist in Gn 1 to Ex 3^{15}, we find 48 uses of Elohim as a proper name, and twelve cases in which it occurs in the phrases, 'the fear, the angel (3), or the angels (1), the house (2), the host, the Spirit, the face of God,' and 'in the stead of God' (2). This use of Elohim begins at ch. 20 and occurs later in other fifteen chapters. On the other hand, Yahweh as the divine name is used in Gn 1 to Ex 3^{15}, 146 times. How are we to account for the sudden emergence of the name Elohim in Gn 20 to Ex 3^{15}, and for the equally rare use of the same after Ex 3^{15} (only 27 times in JE)? Something definite is required to account for these changes. What is it?

The great majority of scholars have found the explanation to be that, alongside J, a second narrator comes in who, like P, believes that the name Yahweh was only revealed to the Children of Israel at the time of Moses, and who therefore, up to that time, uses the name Elohim as the proper name. Volz, however, declares that two parallel narratives are very unlikely, and that their relationship is very difficult to explain. As a matter of fact, Yahweh occurs twice in $15^{1\cdot 2}$ and once in 22^{11} in supposed E passages. The Yahwist uses Elohim sometimes when he wishes to speak not of the God of Israel in particular, but of the divine existence and character in general (as Gn $28^{17\cdot 22}$), when he refers to cult-places such as Beth-el and Penu-el, and when the speech is with foreigners (as Gn 31^{42} and in the Joseph-story 41^{16}, etc.). This last point is fully shared by the other side, but these cases are comparatively few in number. Moreover, we no longer have the complete document E before us. Frequently only fragments remain, and 'it has undergone transpositions and curtailments, which place its original form beyond our reach, but its chief affinities can still be traced.'[2]

E affirms that the forefathers of Israel 'beyond the River' were idolators (Jos 24^{2}, Gn $35^{2\cdot 4}$ and 31^{19}), whereas J seems to regard the worship of Yahweh as primæval (Gn 4^{26}) and as common to Jacob and Laban (31^{49}). E is less anthropomorphic than J in his account of divine communications. There is no personal wrestler (as J, Gn $32^{24\cdot 31}$), no visit in human form to Abraham's tent (as J, ch. 18). God comes in vision (Gn 15^{1}) or in dream by night (20^{3}, etc.). He speaks by His angel from heaven (21^{17}, etc.) and by prophets (20^{7} 41^{38}, Ex 15^{20}, Nu $11^{25\cdot 30}$). E has his own phrases. Horeb is his name for 'the Mount of God' (cf. D), contrast Sinai (Ex $19^{11b.\ c.}$ $34^{2\cdot 4}$, etc.). Amorites are his designation of the original inhabitants of Canaan (13 times, contrast Canaanites). Much more might be added, but space forbids.

Volz replies that the one narrator is not to be tied down to one expression. He can say 'venison' *and* savoury meat in Gn 27, 'maidservant' *and* handmaid in Gn 29 and 30, etc. Horeb more probably comes from Deuteronomy than *vice versa*. Small repetitions may be merely postscripts as in the prophetic writings. In longer passages the same narrator may weave several 'motives' together or even combine originally distinct accounts of earlier stories. Moreover, some later editor may have added new versions more suitable for worship or instruction. E may have been the re-publisher, but was not an original narrator. He may, in some cases, have revised and rewritten. A member of the Deuteronomic School may have done this when the books were put into one collection.

These being the two theories, how do they work out in practice?

Let us take first ch. $20^{1\cdot 17}$ which the Oxford *Hexateuch* assigns to E. (i) It uses the name

[1] *The Hexateuch*, ed. J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby (1900), i. 110.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 112.

fits in with the earlier use of E (and so 20^{18-21}). In 21^{6} $22^{8-9.\ 28}$ Elohim probably stands for the earthly representative of the divine Judge. Ch. 5 defined the relation between Decalogue and Code. Ch. 4 merely refers to this in passing; he speaks of a particular point which conditions the giving of the Decalogue, namely, that when this was given they saw no outward form. From this he deduced that no image of the deity was legitimate. Why did he do this instead of quoting as authoritative the second commandment? Was it not that this latter was understood to forbid only the use of pagan images. Neither Elijah nor Amos protested against Calf-worship. Hosea, however, did protest ($8^{5f.}$ 10^{5} 13^{2}). It would seem, however, more probable that the Decalogue, which now appears in ch. 5, only reached that form at a date subsequent to the first writing of that chapter, and that a later editor substituted it for the original. In ch. 9^{7-24} the nation is accused of a series of rebellions from the earliest day and special reference is made to the Calf-worship, as recorded in Ex 32, E. This cannot have been later than the Return from Exile, for Aaron is identified with the people and severely condemned, and 'the Sons of Levi' (Ex 32^{26-29}) are spoken of with honour. In Judæa, after the Return, this would have been impossible. Ch. 9 therefore seems to belong to the Northern Kingdom. Turning now to addresses which come after the Code, Welch (*Post-Exilic Judaism*, 188 ff.) seeks to derive from chs. 28 and 32 evidence, showing that the Israelites, who remained in Northern Israel amid heathen settlers, refused to accept defeat and sought to preserve their national and religious identity. In ch. 28 he sees a long 'Litany' in which the people acknowledge that they have deserved all that has come upon them and 'face the blows of fate with grave self-discipline.' But I can find no trace of its being a Litany, no sign of the nation realizing its demerit. In like manner, 'the Song of Moses' (ch. 32) gives the personal assurance of a prophetic soul that the God of Israel will one day avenge the blood of His servants, but I can see no evidence that the nation was repentant and held fast to its faith. 'The men,' Welch says, 'were prepared to acknowledge that what they suffered was not unmerited. In this acknowledgment there is an indomitable note.' With the best will in the world, I can recognize no such note.

Again, it is questionable whether the Chronicler's account of a call from Hezekiah to North Israel to come and worship in Jerusalem can be regarded as trustworthy in the absence of any corroboration in 2 K. The call from Hezekiah, Welch thinks, may have prompted the Northern Israelites to enact a law for themselves against inter-marriage with the heathen and that this decision finds expression in ch. 7. This seems precarious reasoning. Is there here much more than an expansion of Ex 34^{11-16} (which, by the way, is a passage generally assigned to J)?

There are certain isolated passages which show that Northern Israel did so far as possible continue to maintain their own faith. Jeremiah (41^{5}) tells us that men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria, eighty in number, with beards shaven, clothes rent, and self-inflicted wounds, came with oblations and frankincense in their hands to bring them to the house of Yahweh. The house had by this time been burnt down. These men must either have been ignorant of its fate, or an attempt was being made to continue worship within its ruined walls.

Zechariah ($7^{1ff.}$) tells us that certain men from Bethel came to Jerusalem in the days of that prophet to entreat the favour of Yahweh and to ask whether they should continue the practice of weeping in the fifth month as they had done for so many years. So far, Welch's thesis seems sound. On the other hand, there are also evidences which suggest that Northern religion was of a very mixed character, at least in a large proportion of cases. There is much to be said, *e.g.*, for Dr. Oesterley's view that the Israelite community of Elephantiné came from the Northern tribes, who had been carried away captive to Assyria. There they had adopted Aramaic as their language, and in the Papyrus letters they speak of themselves as Aramæans. Considerable numbers of these seem to have joined the Assyrian armies of Asshur-bani-pal and helped him to conquer Egypt in 667 B.C. Later, those who remained in Egypt took service under Psammeticus. These colonists worshipped Yahu and with him they associated two goddesses, Ashima (Ishtar), as Am 8^{14}, and Anath (cf. place-names, Jos 21^{18} 19^{38} 15^{59}; cf. Jg 3^{31} 5^{6}). If Anath was a fertility-goddess and apparently the spouse of Yahu, it would seem that this is a form of the Tammuz-Ishtar cult, adapted to the worship of Yahweh (cf. Jer 7^{18} $44^{15.\ 17.\ 19.\ 25}$, Ezk 8^{14}).

A second piece of evidence to the same effect has been adduced by Dr. Oesterley from the Song of Solomon. The references to Damascus (6^{5}), Lebanon (4 times), etc. etc., point to the North as the original source, though the final collector of the Songs probably lived in the South and added some Southern songs. Now the most probable of the interpretations of the Songs seems to be that they had their source in the fertility-cult which the Hebrews took

over from the agricultural Canaanites on their settlement in Canaan. These Songs have been adapted to human lovers, but were originally songs of Tammuz and Ishtar.

If this interpretation is justified, we have further evidence that the Northern worship was mixed with heathen elements, and it is argued that while the religious leaders after the Exile succeeded in stamping out the alien cults in Judæa, they failed to do so in the North, and that therefore Ezra and his fellows were justified in their attitude towards the Northerners.

Ch. 31^{9-13} seems to lay down that the Code was to be 'read before all Israel in their hearing at the end of every seven years at the feast of Tabernacles.' So far I agree with the Professor, but when he goes on to argue that 31^{26} was inserted by men of the Return in order to relegate the Code to obscurity alongside the Ark, and that ch. 10^{1-5} was intended to produce the same effect, I find it difficult to agree with him.

It is an interesting point, which Welch brings out well, that there seems to have grown up in the religious literature of Israel two divergent attitudes towards the period in the wilderness. According to one (ch. $9^{7ff.}$ and, *e.g.*, Ps 106) it was a time of constantly recurring rebellion and murmuring on the part of Israel. On the other hand, to Hosea (2^{14-15}) and Jeremiah the time of the wilderness was the time when Israel was in peculiarly intimate relation with its divine head. The nation was then wholly dependent on God and had found Him all it needed. Not that these two views meant two series of historical traditions. Rather it meant that each writer selected from the common tradition those incidents which served his purpose. These were not told for mere history's sake, but rather to point a religious lesson. The manna of Ex 16^{4} and the water of 17^{6} (both E) showed how God satisfied His people of old and how He would do the same in days to come.

Finally, we must look at the historical introduction. The usual understanding of chs. 2 and 3 is that Moses led his people through the midst of Edom and Moab and brought them to the field of Moab opposite Jericho. Welch (*Framework*, ch. xiii.) shows strong reasons for challenging this view. According to him Israel passed along outside the border of Edom and Moab as far as Arnon ($2^{8.\ 24}$). Crossing this, they attacked and defeated Sihon and Og and divided Gilead among the two and a half tribes. Five stages (Nu 21^{13-20}) took them from the upper reaches of Arnon to a ravine opposite Beth-peor on the slopes of Pisgah, opposite to Mount Ebal across Jordan. This agrees with fragments of an E account in Nu 21 (21^{20} and 22^{1} contain insertions), and it agrees with Jephthah's argument in Jg 11. If this be true, and it seems to be, we see a number of tribes crossing Jordan at this point and proceeding at once inland into Ephraim to set up great stones on Mount Ebal, bearing the words of the Law, and to erect an altar for sacrifice to Yahweh. It may be true that the first sacrifice was thus offered on Mount Ebal (Dt 27^{1-8}), but it is extremely doubtful that this, as Welch says, was the establishment of 'the leading sanctuary' at which the people were to sacrifice to Yahweh on strictly Mosaic lines, and at which the levitical priests were the appointed custodians. Nothing here or in Jos $8^{30ff.}$ refers to more than the one occasion upon which sacrifice was offered either on Mount Ebal or at Shechem. Never, after Jos 24^{8}, is Shechem mentioned as a sanctuary of Yahweh at all (see *Since Wellhausen* for fuller discussion, 114 f.).

Welch goes on to describe how Israel was saved from falling back into pure heathenism (1) by the founding of the Kingdom, and (2) by the rise of the prophetic movement. Under the United Kingdom the book of the covenant was put together (Ex 20–23). The separation of the two Kingdoms led to North Israel not only collecting its traditions of early days (E) and of the first entrance into Canaan (Jg), but also of its laws (Dt), while Judæa, in like manner, produced J and H (Lv 19–26). At the same time the prophets of Israel became most influential, and their influence is to be seen in E and in Deuteronomy. North Israel went down in ruin before Sargon (721 B.C.), but under Josiah what remained in the land was drawn closer to Jerusalem and as a result J and E were united (JE), the histories were united (1 and 2 K), Deuteronomy was brought into line by the addition of Dt 12^{1-7} and 24^{4-7}. Ephraim continued to go to Jerusalem after the Fall of Jerusalem. A solemn pact (Neh 10) was formed to maintain a provisional altar (Jer $41^{4ff.}$). At the Return, and especially under Ezra, the conservative spirit gained the upper hand. A new altar was set up by the men of Judæa only. North Israelite Levites were refused the privileges of the priesthood. Deuteronomy was laid aside and P, both in language and attitude, was finally built up on the lines of H (Lv 19–26).

Some parts of this reconstruction are distinctly doubtful, but it may well be that in many respects it may eventually 'convince the gainsayers.'