

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

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

Eltolad in all probability means 'Place of obtaining children', i. e. the seat of a shrine to which women were accustomed to resort in order to supplicate the mother-goddess (Aštar) for the coveted boon of fruitfulness. We may recall the statement of Herodotus (i 131) that the Assyrians call Aphrodite (i. e. Ištar) Mylitta, i. e. no doubt, *muallidat* 'she who causes to bear'.

As regards Elteḫē, Dr Margoliouth suggests to me a connexion with the Arabic *iltāḫa*, Conj. VIII of *laḫa*, in the sense 'Place of combat'. It may be doubted, however, whether a Canaanite town would be likely to obtain its name from the accident of one or more battles having occurred at or near it; and, if the name stands for Ešteḫē, the derivation from עָשָׂה 'give to drink' in the sense 'watering-place' appears not improbable. For the Iftē'al of *šakū* we may compare *Gilgameš-Epic* vii col. 4 l. 40 *kašāti ištaḫku* 'cool draughts they give to drink'. Here *ištaḫku* might equally well have been *iltāku*.

As to the meaning of Elteḫon nothing can be affirmed, since no root עָשָׂה or לָקַח is otherwise known in any Semitic language.

C. F. BURNEY.

THE STUDY OF COMPOSITE WRITINGS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

WE are so accustomed at the present day to the features of literary analysis and the recognition of glosses, insertions, and the like, that we are sometimes apt, perhaps, to overlook the limitations of literary criticism and equally apt to ignore some of its possibilities. It is frequently possible to produce the clearest proof that this or the other source is of composite origin, and fortunately we possess sufficient evidence for the comparison of varying forms of such compositeness, so that we are in a position to shew that the method of compilation which we infer in the case of a unique source is essentially identical with that which we can perceive elsewhere from a comparison of variant sources or recensions.¹ But it is much to be regretted that there is no extant investigation of the phenomena of literary compositeness, and consequently these notes must necessarily be of a somewhat provisional character. To illustrate my meaning I propose to start with Habakkuk i and ii: the compositeness of which is very generally recognized by modern scholars, although there is little unanimity as to the extent of the compositeness, the

¹ See, for example, A. A. Bevan in *Camb. Bibl. Essays* pp. 13 sqq.

details of analysis, and the historical background of the constituent parts. Indeed, the most recent enquiry, that of Mr G. G. V. Stonehouse, supports the unity of i-ii (apart from ii 12-14, 18-20), and since his book is a careful and scholarly plea for the more conservative attitude towards Habakkuk, it will be convenient to start from his position. In his view Hab. i and ii date shortly after the battle of Carchemish (605 B.C.) when Egypt was defeated by Nebuchadrezzar, and they belong to the time when Judah was beginning to rebel against the Chaldeans, the sequel of which was the invasion of the marauding bands mentioned in 2 Kings xxiv 2 (*Book of Hab.* pp. 46-52). Now, if it be true that the Chaldeans before 605 'had shewn a friendly attitude towards the Syrian states rather than the reverse' (p. 106), we must suppose that the 'nations' referred to in i 5 sqq. ii forthwith suffered the afflictions described by Habakkuk, but that subsequently some at least were used by Nebuchadrezzar to harry Jehoiakim. The exact date of the raids in 2 Kings xxiv 2 is disputed, and the history of the period is certainly meagre (pp. 85, 87); but such evidence as we have makes it more than improbable that the severity of the Chaldeans, as depicted by the prophet, can be dated shortly after 605. We may, on demand, ignore the evidence for the departure of Nebuchadrezzar to Babylonia after the battle of Carchemish, but a careful study of the account of the Chaldean excesses in i seq. has very justly led several scholars to conclude that they point to an evil of no inconsiderable duration. In fact, Mr Stonehouse himself observes after i 2 ('how long shall I cry' &c.), that the prophet had constantly addressed Yahweh against the trouble and mischief caused by the Chaldeans (pp. 55 sq.), and it is very difficult to reconcile the verse with the proposal to date the two chapters about 604-603 (p. 51).

Moreover, the date can hardly be reconciled with the prophecies ascribed to Jeremiah. Here the battle of Carchemish is regarded as a great turning-point in history. It meant the impending downfall of the nations; the Chaldeans were the instruments of Yahweh's wrath, and there are many references to the persistent idolatry of Judah and the inevitable punishment. Mr Stonehouse, however, rejects the ordinary view that Hab. i 2-4 depicts the internal wickedness in Judah, and prefers to find religious-political disturbances caused by the oppressions of the Chaldeans in the neighbouring states. He conjectures two Judean parties, one doubtless favouring alliance with Egypt, the other representative of the earlier Deuteronomic party of Josiah's time, and of the still earlier policy of submission to Yahweh and to Assyria as held by Isaiah (pp. 23, 52 sq.). It is true that later, in the time of Zedekiah, Jeremiah counselled submission to the Chaldeans, and Mr Stonehouse would ascribe the same policy to

Habakkuk (i 12; p. 59). Yet this is surely a difficult and unnatural interpretation. We need not discuss whether the righteous party was really representative of the Deuteronomic school (p. 53), and, if so, whether Jeremiah would be in opposition to it (viii 8?); but if we are to emphasize Habakkuk's relationship to Isaiah (pp. 62 sq.), Isaiah's doctrine of the inviolability of Zion is evidently related to 'the incurable optimism of the religious leaders' (Peake on Jer. vi 14), that is, of those whom Jeremiah denounced as false prophets (cf. xiv 13 sq.). Quite apart from this, Jeremiah's policy is clearly expressed, his position is politically intelligible, his message is essentially practical: at a time when we have evidence for the panic caused by the Chaldean invasion he advises submission as the only hope (xxi 9, xxxviii 2 sq.). He was justified by the history of Zedekiah's time and by the sequel which proves the pacific character of the Chaldean conquest. The attitude ascribed to Habakkuk, on the other hand, can be read only between the lines and eludes explanation; at a time when there is no evidence for the disturbances described or implied in i sq., he holds out the expectation that the proud oppressors must ultimately succumb, and he comforts his followers with the assurance that the righteous shall live by faith. Consequently, Mr Stonehouse's position seems untenable. In any case the prophet is obviously concerned with the welfare of his own people (cf. p. 33), and the simplest interpretation of i 2-4 finds in these verses a condemnation of the wrong-doing in Judah. Hence it is only in accordance with the thought of Jeremiah that this should be followed by a punishment, and it seems unnecessary to emend (as Mr Stonehouse does) the opening words of v. 6: 'for, lo, I raise up the Chaldeans.' In spite of various obscurities in this verse it is clear from v. 12 that the enemy was 'ordained' for judgement and 'established' for correction. The sequence appears to be perfectly suitable (cf. Zeph. i 4-6 and its sequel), although serious difficulties are at once caused, (a) by the description of the *existing* excesses of the Chaldeans, and (b) by the references to the sufferings, not of Judah, but of the *nations*.

Now the Jewish philosophy of history saw a necessary connexion between sin and suffering—the Chaldean invasion, the fall of Jerusalem, and the exile were inevitable penalties. But Israel was the people of Yahweh, Yahweh was the God of Israel; the punishment could not last for ever, the sin in course of time was worked off (Is. xl 2). Yahweh had indeed been angry with his people; now comes the stage when he is angry because of the excesses of his people's foes. This developement in the history of thought, of great significance for the criticism of the prophetic writings, is clearly formulated in Zech. i 15. After the expiration of the period of punishment when the land had

'paid off' its debts (2 Chron. xxxvi 21), Yahweh, who had aforetime left his city (cf. Ezek. x 18 sq., xi 23), returns again with consolations (cf. *ib.* xliii 4 sq.); in former days he had purposed evil, now he is jealous on behalf of Zion with great jealousy and with great fury (Zech. i 14-17, viii 2, 11, 14). The transition is equally clear in Is. xlvii 6: Yahweh had profaned his inheritance and had given it to strangers (cf. Jer. xii 7), but they had been harsh and merciless; the instruments of his wrath had been boastful and vain-glorious, and the offence of Assyria (Is. x 12 sq., Zeph. ii 15) is now that of 'the daughter of the Chaldeans' (Is. xlvii 7 sq.), and Babylon (*ib.* xiv; with *v.* 8 contrast Hab. ii 17). To this sin of the Chaldeans there are evident references in Hab. i 11 ('whose strength is his god') and 16 ('he sacrificeth unto his net' &c.). The transition may also be elucidated by the figure of the 'cup' of Yahweh's wrath.¹ Placed in the hands of Babylon (Jer. li 7), it could not pass untasted by Yahweh's own people, much less by the nations (Jer. xxv 15 sq., 29). But at length the time comes when the 'cup' drained by Jerusalem will be taken by Yahweh and given to her oppressors (Is. li 17, 22), and thus in Hab. ii 16 'the cup of Yahweh's right hand' is ultimately to be turned to the Chaldeans.

What was a transition in the history of thought becomes a feature of literary compositeness when the condemnation of guilt is at once followed by the condemnation of those who are the instruments of punishment. In Jer. xxv 15 sqq. all the nations are to drink of Yahweh's cup of wrath, but the words in *v.* 26 *b* 'and the king of Sheshach (Babel) after them' are wanting in the LXX, and are a recognized addition. No less obvious is the secondary origin of *vv.* 12-14 which herald the punishment of Babylon after the seventy years of desolation which Judah and the nations must suffer for their sins. Not to multiply examples of this *literary* transition, it may suffice to note the subtle change in Zeph. iii, where the wickedness of Judah (*vv.* 3-7) is followed by the words 'therefore, wait ye for me, saith Yahweh, for the day when I rise up as a witness' (*v.* 8, see Driver *Cent. Bible*). But instead of the idea of Yahweh as a witness against the iniquity of Judah, the *nations* are gathered together to be punished, and we pass on (*vv.* 11 sq.) to the triumph of Zion. The punishment of Judah, intelligible on the lines of the prophecies of Jeremiah, is wanting; and it is replaced, not by the sufferings of a penitent people, but by the still later transition, the punishment of oppressive foes. This feature, in combination with

¹ This subject may be illustrated by the sculpture from Zenjirli (N. Syria) representing two figures (one perhaps a deity) sitting at a table spread with food, and each holding a cup to the mouth. This so-called Ceremonial Feast is widely distributed in N. Syria and Asia Minor in variant forms; see J. Garstang *Land of the Hittites* pp. 100 sq., 164.

others, leads to the view that the small book of Zephaniah seems to have passed through the hands of writers representative of stages of thought which can be understood elsewhere in more organic connexions and in more complete passages (*Ency. Brit.*, art. 'Zephaniah'). And this appears to be true of Habakkuk. There is a certain interconnexion and consecutiveness, but there are changing backgrounds and changing bodies of thought; there is, as often in the biblical narratives, a superficial unity, but closer examination, as in these cases, reveals the presence of different circles of ideas.

The interest of the writers is manifestly in Israel, and the denunciation of evil in Judah (Hab. i 2-4) is quite intelligibly followed by the threatened approach of the agents of Yahweh's wrath. But the text of i 5, 6 has several difficulties, and thus may be connected with the fact that the scene shifts and the *nations* are suffering from the enemy. Mr Stonehouse suggests that an exilic or post-exilic editor 'so altered the text in v. 5 and v. 6 a as to make the prophet announce as a future event the appearance of the Chaldean rather than refer to that power as a present evil and scourge within the land' (p. 32). On the alternative view, the later writer has replaced an announcement of impending doom by an account of the evil of the scourge in his own time. Probably the revision of i is more intricate. The iniquity of the enemy is combined with some anticipation of a retribution. Their evil is incompatible with Yahweh's character, and the writer remonstrates. There is no sense of well-merited punishment. Punishment might be a purification (cf. Jer. ix 3-9) and might lead to repentance and a return to Yahweh (cf. Lamentations). But there is a feeling of protest, as though Israel had paid the penalty of sin and now awaited the intervention of Yahweh. It is not, as in Zeph. iii 1 sqq., that Yahweh had proved *his* righteousness, had overthrown nations, but had still to complain of his polluted city. Yahweh has his 'righteous' ones (i 13) and they are suffering unjustly. Yahweh himself is installed in his city—in his holy temple (ii 20); but there is no triumph, no series of glorious promises, no expectation of a new era. Indeed, in ch. iii it is as though his faithful ones must needs call to mind how great had been his deeds in the distant past. There is a note of resignation mingled with quiet confidence—Yahweh is from everlasting, Israel will not die (i 12), and the 'righteous' placed in the midst of affliction and wrong, like the 'afflicted and poor' people in Zeph. iii 12, must persist in their integrity. The righteous shall live by their steadfastness in Yahweh (ii 4). The original message was hardly for the nation or for the Jewish church, but for the pious remnant. We are taken away from any religious or political turmoil of the times of Jeremiah, Habakkuk, or Zephaniah; we are scarcely in Palestine of the sixth or fifth century;

we seem to move in a world of thought upon which light is thrown only by the latest Psalms.

It is not my aim to do more than reassert the compositeness of Hab. i, ii, and the foregoing remarks have perhaps shewn that in dealing with composite literature it is important to determine whether the factors which account for the compositeness of one book account, in some measure at least, for that of another. That is to say, just as we may co-ordinate to a certain extent the component sources of the Pentateuch or of Joshua-Kings, so perhaps we may have to recognize that the internal intricacies of the prophetic writings may be brought into some sort of interrelation by the discovery of a certain similarity in the causes of the complexities. Another point emerges. On the most moderate view, that of Mr Stonehouse, the book of Habakkuk consists of the original prophecy taken up by a later writer (*a*) who re-shaped i 5, 6 *a*, (*b*) a Psalm, iii, has been added, but (*c*) this is expanded with an introduction and a new conclusion; (*d*) ii 20 is a transitional verse, and (*e*) ii 12-14 and 18-19 are later additions. Of course *d* may be associated with *b* and *c*, but obviously we have to admit the presence of a very considerable extent of literary activity, and it would be quite plausible to argue that the factors which account for Mr Stonehouse's analysis account also for the more subtle intricacies which he is not prepared to recognize. In any case it is one of the limitations of literary criticism that the factors which explain the more obvious complexities may have brought changes which are less easily recognizable or which indeed may even be quite immaterial.

On any theory we have to visualize composite records, and unless we endeavour to represent to ourselves their literary history as they have passed through successive hands, sometimes with excision, mutilation, and addition, our criticism is apt to be incomplete. Thus the attempt should be made to visualize the common view that N. Israelite literature was taken over by Judah after 722, and that pre-exilic documents were conveyed to Babylon and brought back to Judah by the exiles who returned. A more complex task is to treat the common critical view of the Pentateuch on these lines: J and E, each with successive additions, a combined J E, the separate literary growth of D, *its* combination with J E, the separate literary growth of P, and *its* combination with J E D. The result should be correlated (approximately) with the growth of the other books. Much of modern criticism seems unreal because of the incompleteness of the work of synthesis. One thing is clear. A composite source comes down to us in the form that the last editor, reviser, or writer gave to it, and familiar as we are with ancient methods of treating the material, we may regard the extant source as bearing his *imprimatur*. Hence, if Genesis shews traces of mutilation, excision,

and revision, it is extremely significant that the last hands have preserved by the side of P the non (or anti)-prophetic narratives of J E. We may be sure that the latter were not preserved for antiquarian purposes, and if they reveal conflicting traditions and conceptions the primary fact is that they *survive*. It is evident also that the elimination of later additions or sources does not necessarily leave the earlier source in its original extent. Thus the omission of the fragmentary acrostic in Nahum leaves the opening of the prophecy incomplete, and the excision of the post-exilic conclusion to Amos still makes the want of *some* conclusion felt. J begins in Gen. ii 4 b, but assuredly not the original J, and the recognition that the source was more complete once is an immediate gain, more substantial than any conjecture, whether P in Gen. i 1—ii 3 has preserved or rewritten any of the lost material. So also the fragmentary and older account of the Tent of Meeting in Ex. xxxiii 7—11 presupposes some fuller, more organic narrative, and whether or no P in the preceding chapters preserves in post-exilic form any of the material, it is of the greatest interest to perceive that there was some fairly considerable body of data distinct from P in content and standpoint. Again, Gen. vi 1—4 evidently preserve a fragment of *something* which has no real connexion with its present surroundings and reflects a body of thought organically different from either J or E. Without pursuing this further, I would only say that, to me at least, the phenomena of literary compositeness reveal the existence of a literature and a world of thought of impressive extent.

We have in the Old Testament all that remains of a considerable body of writings differing often in tone and point of view from the literature we regard as 'canonical'. Are we to assume that with the incorporation of, e. g., Ex. xxxiii 7—11, the more complete narrative (or any other copy of it) was lost or destroyed? or may we suppose that there persisted, say in the Persian and Greek ages, writings apart from those preserved in the Old Testament? It is proper to raise the question since the parallels to Gen. vi 1—4, which recur in later and non-canonical literature, can hardly be based upon this passage, but point to the persistence of traditions and thought similar to those represented in the 'canonical' verses. And, in fact, the more one studies the features of the apocryphal, pseudepigraphical, and Rabbinical writings, the more necessary it is to regard the Old Testament as all that *survives* from earlier Palestine. As Prof. Bennett has said of the popular mythological references, there was probably 'a literature of the subject, which was partly lost, partly suppressed in the supposed interests of a higher faith' (*Rev. of Theol. and Philos.* v 679). Criticism, then, must take account not only of the Old Testament, but of that larger field which lies immediately behind it.

Every one will doubtless agree that the Old Testament is the result of deliberate and intentional literary activity. It is placed in a historical framework which modern criticism has good reason for questioning. While the early writers had their own perspective of history from the time of Adam to the Samaritan schism in the days of Nehemiah, it is the ultimate aim of modern criticism to place their sacred writings in the larger and profounder history of mankind. As a Roman Catholic writer has recently reminded us: 'Das historische Gesamtbild kann unter dem Einfluss der Tendenz verzeichnet sein, ohne dass die Elemente der Erzählung unwahr sind.'¹ It is one of the aims of historical criticism to reconsider the actual course of events, and to find a framework which shall be more in accordance with modern knowledge. The endeavour has naturally been to preserve as much of the traditional framework as possible, and to determine what elements are genuine and valuable. This has entailed the rejection (for purposes of history) of a very considerable amount of material, which, instead of reappearing in the new synthesis, remains, so to speak, in the wastepaper basket. In not a few cases the knots have been merely cut and new problems remain, as difficult as the old. The weaknesses in the reconstruction of the development of Israelite religion have been pointed out by conservative scholars, who, despite their failure to recognize the necessity of literary and historical criticism, have much right on their side. For example, we may conclude that the fierce and barbarous treatment of the Canaanites by the Israelites is unhistorical, and that we have merely the erroneous or idealized view of the invasion as held by a Deuteronomic writer of the seventh century. The consequence, however, is that our late writer evidently had a standard of religion and morality quite incompatible with higher ideas of the Godhead; see J. Orr *The Problem of the Old Testament* p. 468 sq. As an example of incompleteness in historical criticism I would cite the current treatment of 2 Sam. ii 9-10. The commentators observe that it is very doubtful whether Saul's younger son Ishbosheth could have been forty years of age; and, besides, his reign of two years agrees neither with David's reign of seven and a half, nor with the submission of Israel at the death of Ishbosheth. The verses are accordingly treated as a gloss or insertion, and are placed in the wastepaper-basket with obvious gain to our conception of the course of events. But can the difficulty be so easily removed? Whence the origin of the inconvenient data? They were hardly 'invented' and inserted in order to confuse the narrative; and if we grant that they are deliberate, it is clear that they presuppose some tradition or record of the Saulidae which ran on lines different from the extant sources. And in fact elsewhere there are data which it

¹ A. Allgeier *Doppelberichte in der Genesis* (1911; p. 125).

seems natural to reject simply because they conflict with narratives which appear to be essential to the framework. None the less, it is reasonable to suppose that North Israel might possess traditions of Saul which differed from those in 1 and 2 Samuel, where the North Israelite king is placed in a somewhat unfavourable light.

Proceeding further, we cannot fail to notice that Gen. iv 26 points to a body of thought which, in dating the worship of Yahweh in the time of Enosh, is quite distinct from the 'canonical' perspective according to which the name Yahweh was first made known to Israel by Moses. This body of thought belongs to a circle which evidently has had some share in the literary growth of our Old Testament. Moreover, the Cainite genealogy, like some other fragments preserved in Genesis, belongs to a perspective of the history of man, in which there was no Deluge. It would be futile to guess how such a history ran, but it will be seen that we have to recognize groups of traditions or 'histories' very different from the canonical framework. A more striking feature is the growing recognition of traditions in Genesis of a permanent settlement (see *J. T. S.* xii p. 467 sq.); that is to say, the sojourn in Egypt, and the Exodus, the profoundest event in Israelite national history, found no place among the traditions of some circle or circles of whose literature some fragments have been allowed to survive. Other illustrations could be cited, but perhaps enough has been said to shew that there is room for a more thorough investigation of the fragmentary, isolated, or conflicting data which in some conspicuous cases presuppose forms of tradition and thought quite distinct from those upon which many of our conceptions of Israel are based. It is often feared that literary analysis has been carried too far, that the alleged complexity is too extravagant and incredible; the truth rather seems to be that biblical criticism has not yet reached that stage where the intricacies can be properly handled. It seems highly probable that we should recognize both a literary and a historical compositeness, and this is not unreasonable when we consider the varied elements which made up Israel in, let us say, the age of D and P. Literary criticism, since the work of Wellhausen, has recognized that there were different views of the religious past of Israel; conservative writers justly perceive that religion and history are inextricably interwoven; the stage has yet to be reached where the significance of compositeness and of variant forms of tradition and thought can be thoroughly investigated and more consistently and adequately explained.

It may be objected that this is not to reconstruct the developement of Israelite history and religion. The reply is twofold: the patient and laborious work of Pentateuchal analysis in the past seemed perhaps equally unlikely to throw the light upon the Old Testament that it

actually succeeded in throwing, and anything which tends to bring out the full significance of the Old Testament must inevitably be valuable for the internal history of Palestine and hence for the history of man. Besides, in any endeavour to reconstruct, we have to remember that the old Jewish historians themselves have given us their history, and that criticism has shewn that the material they used has been subordinated to their aim. The Old Testament may accordingly be likened to some Palestinian house built, as is often the case, with stone from mediaeval and ancient ruins. Stones of Byzantine, Roman, and earlier date, and may-be the fragment of an inscribed slab, would tell their tale of methods of building, forms of culture, and their changes. But the material has been deliberately utilized for a house in accordance with the builder's skill and needs. The criticisms of a European architect accustomed to modern improvements would be, from one point of view, entirely irrelevant, owing to his particular point of view, knowledge, and mode of life. From another point of view, this house would continue to gain in interest as more was learned of its history, contents, and surroundings. It still remains a house, whether the material came from a ruined Byzantine church, a Roman villa, or an older gateway.

These one could not reconstruct, though it might ultimately be found that the church must have a house, the villa a bath, and the gateway a wall. Is it not so with the Old Testament? The more we know of the structure of the composite writings the more difficult the task of replacing the *Gesamtbild*, the result of deliberate and careful labour, by another based upon a selection of the material. Finally, we must not forget that the deficiencies which have been found in the Old Testament (whether due to structure or material) are intelligible—and explicable—now that *our* attitude has changed (e. g. as regards Gen. i–xi), and it may well be the case that *our* anxiety to recover the facts of history and the genuine utterances of a prophet is an equally imperfect attitude which is leading up to yet another stage where the value of the Old Testament will be brought immediately home to the great mass of people. That Isaiah was inspired to write the sixty-six chapters which pass under his name is a view which can no longer be held. Literary criticism, whether 'moderate' or 'extreme', holds out intricate analyses ascribing these chapters to a considerable number of writers. Is it not a great gain to our knowledge of the developement of mankind to replace a single inspired writer by many men of different dates who heard within them the voice of God, and uttered their messages in the thought and phraseology of their times?

STANLEY A. COOK.