

CHAPTER THREE THE LINGUISTIC ARGUMENT EXAMINED

When we test the claims of the critics by these principles, the first question is, what *a priori* right have they to analyze the Pentateuchal Codes? The most plausible answer refers us to the use of the divine names in Genesis in connection with the fact, that the writers of the Elohist and Jehovistic documents had evidently both planned a history covering the time from creation down to the conquest of the Holy Land. Here, however, a difficulty appears. The whole body of Pentateuchal legislation falls after Exod. 6:2, 3; and so the basis on which the right of analysis would rest, breaks down immediately. And, as to the prospective features of the Elohist and Jehovistic documents, they are most easily accounted for by ascribing them to the redaction of Moses, who may have combined the two so as to form a real unity.

Still, we must admit that these considerations, whilst they deprive the argument of independent value, do not entirely destroy its basis. There can be no objection against here also using the criteria furnished by an analysis of Genesis, where there certainly exists, in the alternation of divine names, an *a priori* right to attempt the analysis. If it were possible to show that they re-appear after Exod. 6:2, 3, with the same, or even greater, frequency and regularity, in lengthy coherent passages, which admit of an easy and natural separation from their context, in that case it might not be easy to dispute further the claims of critical analysis to the whole domain of the Pentateuch. Both Kuenen (“Hist. krit. Onderz.,” 1861, i. p. 85) and Delitzsch (“Genesis,” 4te Ausg., p. 30) put the argument on this basis. As we shall see hereafter, in the hands of less cautious critics it has long since outgrown these modest beginnings. As far as we have been able to ascertain, the following words and phrases, considered as belonging to the Elohist *usus loquendi* of Genesis, re-appear after Exod. 6:2, 3. Where they are not too numerous, we shall add the references.

1. מגרים (*sojournings* or *pilgrimage*), *passim* in Genesis; Exod. 6:4.
2. אֶחָזָה (*possession*), ten times before Exod. 6:4, *passim* in Leviticus—Numbers, once in an Elohist passage of Deuteronomy, 32:49.
3. לְדִרְתֵיכֶם, לְדִרְתֵנוּ, לְדִרְתֵיךָ, and בְּדִרְתֵנוּ (*in his, their, or your generations*), four times before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 6:9, 17:7, 9, 12; *passim* in the middle books.
4. לְמִינֵנוּ or לְמִינֵהוּ, לְמִינָהּ, לְמִינֵהֶם (*after his, her, or their kind*), sixteen times before Exod. 6:4, nine times in Leviticus, four times in Deuteronomy.
5. בַּעֲצֵם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה (*in the self-same day*), three times before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 7:13, 17:23, 26; three times in Exodus, 12:17, 41, 51; five times in Leviticus, 23:14 (עַד עֲצֵם), 21, 28, 29, 30; once in an Elohist passage of Deuteronomy, 32:48.
6. בְּרִית הַקִּיָּם (*establish a covenant*), six times before Exod. 6:4; once in Exodus, 6:4; once in Leviticus, 26:9; once in Deuteronomy, 8:18 (נָתַן בְּרִית), Gen. 17:2, Num. 25:12).
7. בֶּן־נָכַר (*stranger*), twice before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 17:12, 27; once in Exodus, 12:43; once in

Leviticus, 22:25.

8. נשיא (*prince*), four times before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 17:20, 23:6, 25:16, 34:2; four times in Exodus, 16:22, 22:28, 34:31, 35:27; once in Leviticus, 4:22; sixty-two times in Numbers.

9. The Hiphil of ילד (*beget*), fifty-eight times before Exod. 6:4; once in Leviticus, 25:45; twice in Numbers, 26:29, 58; twice in Deuteronomy, 4:25, 28:41.

10. מקנה (*bought or price*), five times before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 17:12, 13, 23, 27, 23:18; once in Exodus, 12:44; four times in Leviticus, 25:16, 51, 27:22.

11. עולם (*for ever*), with a noun in construction, eight times before Exod. 6:4; thirty-eight times in Exodus–Numbers; four times in Deuteronomy, 13:16, 15:17, 33:15, 27.

12. כל-זכר (*every male*), seven times before Exod. 6:4; once in Exodus, 12:48; three times in Leviticus, 6:18, 29, 12:6; thirteen times in Numbers.

13. שרץ (*bring forth abundantly*), and שרץ (*creeping thing*), seven times before Exod. 6:4; twice in Exodus, 1:7, 8:3 ; *passim* in Leviticus; Deuteronomy 14:19.

14. מאד מאד (*exceedingly*), four times before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 7:19, 17:2, 6, 20; once in Exodus, 1:7; once in Numbers, 14:7.

15. ארץ כנען (*land of Canaan*), *passim* before Exod. 6:4; once in Exodus, 16:35; three times in Leviticus, 14:34, 18:3, 25:38; *passim* in Numbers; Deuteronomy 32:49.

16. פרה ורבה (*be fruitful and multiply*), *passim* in Genesis, Lev. 26:9.

17. מקוה (*gathering together*), Gen. 1:10, Exod. 7:19, Lev. 9:36.

18. אכלה (*food*), four times before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 1:29, 30, 6:21, 9:3; once in Exodus, 16:15; twice in Leviticus, 11:39, 25:6.

19. רמש (*creep*), and רמש (*creeping thing*), *passim* in Genesis; three times in Leviticus, 9:44, 46, 20:25; Deuteronomy 4:18.

20. The emphatic repetition of עשה with כן (*so he did*), once in Genesis, 6:22; six times in Exodus, 7:6, 12:28, 50, 39:32, 43, 40:16; three times in Numbers, 1:54, 8:20, 17:26.

21. The Hiphil of בדל (*separate*), five times in Gen. 1; once in Exodus, 26:33; *passim* in Leviticus; four times in Deuteronomy, 4:41, 10:8, 19:7, 29:21.

22. זכר ונקבה (*male and female*), six times before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 1:27, 5:2, 6:19, 7:3, 9, 16; four times in Leviticus, 3:1, 6 (אם-און), 12:7 (און), 15:33 (ל-ול); Deut. 4:16 (און).

23. קָדוּל עֵדֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל (*the assembly of the congregation of Israel*), Exod. 12:6, and Num. 14:5.
24. לִפְיָ (according to), once before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 47:12; three times in Exodus, 12:4, 16:16, 18; twice in Leviticus, 25:16, 27:16; twice in Numbers, 9:17, 26:54.
25. נֶפֶשׁ (*soul*), in the sense of “person,” *passim* before Exod. 6:4; in Exodus-Numbers, *passim*.
26. גֵּר (*stranger*), twice before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 15:13, 23:4; Exodus-Deuteronomy, *passim*.
27. תּוֹשֵׁב (*sojourner*), once before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 23:4; once in Exodus, 7:45; Lev. 22:10; seven times in Lev. 25; Num. 35:15.
28. כָּל-בָּשָׂר (*all flesh*), *passim* in Genesis; three times in Leviticus, 17:14; Num. 16:22, 18:15, 27:16; Deut. 5:23.
29. שִׁפְחָה (*maidservant*), *passim* before Exod. 6:4; Exod. 6:5, Lev. 19:20.
30. לְמִשְׁפְּחוֹת (*according to families*), with suffixes, *passim* in Genesis; Exodus-Numbers, *passim*.
31. גָּוַע (*expire*), *passim* in Genesis; Num. 17:26, 28, 20:3, 29.
32. שָׁחַט (*slay*), twice before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 22:10, 37:31; Exodus-Numbers, *passim*.
33. שָׁחַת (*destroy*), in the Piel and Hiphil species, *passim* before Exod. 6:4; *passim* in Exodus-Deuteronomy.
34. רָכַשׁ (*get*), and רִכּוּשׁ (*substance*), *passim* in Genesis; Num. 16:32, 35:3.
35. מֵאָה (*hundred*), *passim* in Genesis; *passim* in Exodus-Numbers.
36. שָׁמַע אֵל פֶּה (*hearken unto*), four times before Exod. 6:4, viz., Gen. 3:17, 16:11, 21:17, 39:10; Exod. 6:9, 16, 20.
37. וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ חָהוּא (*that soul shall be cut off*), Gen. 17:14; *passim*, Exodus-Numbers.
38. קִנְיָן (*substance*), Gen. 34:23, 36:6; Lev. 22:11.

We find accordingly that thirty-eight words and phrases in all, which are claimed in Genesis to belong to the *usus loquendi* of the Elohist, re-appear after Exod. 6:2, 3. At first blush, the not inconsiderable number might impress us; but, after the necessary sifting, a very scanty harvest will remain. There is much in this collection that cannot stand the test of our principles laid down above (pp. 25ff.)

1. Some of these terms occur only in Gen. 17, which is confessedly a chapter of legal contents; so that their re-appearance in the Codes has nothing to do with Elohist or Jehovistic authorship. The fact, that they are nowhere else found in Genesis, warrants us to consider them as legal expressions.

This rules out **מקנה** {10} (besides Gen. 17, only in 23:18), **כל־זכר** {12} (besides Gen. 17, only in 34, and there likewise with reference to circumcision). **לדרת** {3} with suffixes (only once besides Gen. 17, viz., 6:9).

2. Likewise we must exclude from the list all words that occur only once or twice in Genesis, since it is an open fallacy to conclude from such few cases that they are Elohist. This applies to **מקוה** {17} (only in Gen. 1:10), the emphatic phrase **בן עשה** {20} (once, Gen. 6:22), **לפי** {24} (once in Genesis, 47:12), **גר** {26} (twice, 15:13, 23:4), **תושב** {27} (only in 23:4), **שחט** {32} (22:10, 37:31), **קנין** {38} (Gen. 34:23, 36:6). In all such cases, the occasional use in Genesis is probably nothing but a prolepsis of legal terms.

3. Neither can we admit as characteristic those words which, though perhaps frequent in Genesis, appear in the Codes in one or two instances at most. It is evident that such isolated words are no index of style. To this class belong **מנרים** {1} (only in Exod. 6:4), **מאד מאד** {14} (Exod. 1:7, Num. 14:7), **פרה ורבה** {16} (Lev. 26:9), **שפחה** {29} (Lev. 19:20), **גוע** {31} (Num. 17 and 20), **רכש** {34} and **רכוש** {34} (Num. 16:32, 35:3), **שמע אל כ** {36} (only in Exod. 6).

4. Our rule stated above, under No. 5, page 28, forbids us to accept as criteria of the Elohist, words which are found also in confessedly Jehovistic passages. Instances of this are **נשיא** {8} (Exod. 22:28 (27)), **שחת** {33} (Exod. 21:26, 32:7), **שמע אל פ** {36} (Gen. 16:11, Jehovist according to Schrader, Knobel, Kayser, Dillmann; 39:10, Jehovist according to Schrader, Kayser, Dillmann), **ארץ כנען** {15} (Gen. 47:13, Jehovist according to Schrader, Kayser).

5. Of the residuum, a considerable number of words are so intimately related to the idea to be expressed or the thing to be mentioned, that it is absurd to call in the influence of Elohist style to explain their occurrence. The thought and expression were inseparable, so that the presence of the former necessarily involved that of the latter. If the Jehovist had found occasion to convey the same ideas, we may expect that he would have employed the same forms. It remains only to ask why these ideas and conceptions are peculiar to the Elohist, but here also the answer is obvious. Critics have assigned the ritual legislation to the Elohist exclusively, and consider his narrative in Genesis as subsidiary to this. It is no wonder, then, that the expressions in question are found neither in the Jehovistic Code nor in the corresponding narrative. We believe that the author did not use them in Exod. 20-23 because he did not touch the subjects which would have given him occasion to do so. The following words are of this character: **למינו** {4} occurring only where the distinction of species is referred to; and even then it is not used exclusively, for the Elohist knows and employs the synonymous term **למשפחתיהם** also (Gen. 8:19, Elohist according to Hupfeld, Knobel, Schrader). It is difficult to see how this word could have found a place in the Covenant-law. The only occasions on which the Elohist uses it are in his account of the creation, of the flood, and in the laws of food, Lev. 11. When the Deuteronomist treats of the same topic, he, too, employs the very same expression. **עולם** {11} with a noun in construction (often followed by **לדרתיכם** {3}), and the phrase **ונכרתה הנפש ההוא** {37} appear only as sanctioning laws that constitute the essential peculiarity of the theocratic people, such as circumcision, the passover, offerings, etc., and accordingly could not be looked for in the Covenant-law, which is rather ethical and civil. **שרץ** {13} means "to creep;" and, if the Jehovist never employs the word, it is simply because he nowhere refers to a creeping thing. It is so little characteristic of the Elohist, that he himself substitutes for it a

number of times the synonym רמש {19}. The Hiphil of בדל {21} is evidently a ritual term (compare Ezek. 22:26, 42:20, (הבדיל בין הקדש להל), denoting the divinely constituted difference between “holy” and “profane.” Hence also it occurs in Gen. 1, where the various created bodies and elements are represented as classified and distinguished from the beginning according to a principle that regulated the plan of a holy Creator. Of course, the Jehovistic legislation is not concerned with such distinctions. זכר ונקבה {22} denotes the physical sex-distinction: to designate the ethical personality, the Elohist chooses איש ואשה as well as the Jehovist (Exod. 36:6; Lev. 23:29, 38; Num. 5:6, 6:2. 30:17). And the Jehovist knows זכר ונקבה also, and uses it occasionally (Gen. 7: 3, Jehovist according to Schrader, Knobel). נפש {25} in the sense of “person:” An examination of the passages in Genesis discloses the fact that the word occurs almost exclusively (when it has this sense of “person”) in connection with numerals. This explains fully why it does not re-appear in the Covenant-law, but rather in Leviticus and Numbers. There it denotes frequently the legal personality of man, that which constitutes him responsible to God and his law. Hence the frequent use of כי נפש to introduce certain laws, especially in Leviticus. That this introduction is lacking in Exod. 20-23 is partly accounted for by the general (less personal or individual) tenor of these laws, partly because, as Keil remarks, in many of them the predicate of the sentence makes provision rather for the object than for the subject of the action referred to, so that the construction of the sentence forbade the emphatic, personal mention of the subject by כי נפש at the beginning. מאת {35} in construction, is not characteristic of the Elohist; since he uses the absolute state just as frequently, and the Jehovistic legislation had no occasion to employ this numeral. The expressions הקים ברית {6} and נתן ברית are not entirely synonymous with the Jehovistic כרת ברית. In the latter, the idea of a covenant made with sacrifice is rendered prominent, and the concurrence of two parties emphasized (compare Ps. 50:6); whilst in נתן ברית and הקים ברית, the fact is brought out, that the covenant-relation springs from God’s free grace; that he stoops to man, and establishes his Covenant amongst men, who could not advance to meet him. It is quite natural, therefore, that in Exod. 20-23, the phrase כרת ברית should repeatedly occur (23:32, 24:8; compare also 34:27); since, according to 24:4, 5, the Sinaitic covenant was solemnly contracted with the offering up of sacrifices. אחזה {2} occurs only six times outside of the Pentateuch and Joshua, if we except Ezek. 40-48, where it is in frequent use. Num. 32:22, which Schrader and Kayser assign to the Jehovist, shows that the word does not belong exclusively to the Elohist diction. It denotes permanent and firmly held property, in contrast with the unsettled, nomadic life of the patriarchs and the Israelites in the desert. This explains its disappearance from the common language after the conquest of Canaan, and its resumption by Ezekiel, who wrote during the captivity. As a proper name, we find it in Gen. 26:26, a passage which Schrader and Kayser give to the Jehovist. בעצם היום הזה {5} appears twelve times in the Pentateuch; in each of these cases, it serves to mark out the accurate date of a momentous event: Gen. 7:13, Noah’s entering the ark; 17:23, 26, the first circumcision; Exod. 12:17, 41, 51, the exodus from Egypt; Lev. 23:14, the second day of Mazzoth; ver. 21, the feast of weeks; ver. 28, 29, 30, the day of atonement; Deut. 32:48, the announcement of Moses’ death.

It is an exceedingly small group to which the host of “satellites” marshaled by the critics has thus gradually dwindled down. Three words only, אכלה {18}, the Hiphil of ילד {9}, and כל-בשר {28} have not found an explanation. The last two are found only once in the Levitical code, the first one twice. The Qal-species of ילד, which (in the sense of “begetting”) the critics claim as characteristically Jehovistic, does not occur in Exod. 20-23; for in 20:4 it means “to bear.” The fact that these three terms occur only in the Levitical law is hardly striking enough to need an explanation.

If thus the argument drawn from the Elohist *usus loquendi* of Genesis proves to be worthless, we can have no great expectations of the independent evidence collected from the Codes themselves. To say that the Levitical law employs a ceremonial terminology which is wanting in the Jehovistic parts of Exodus, is true, but so much so that it amounts to a truism. What use is there in arraying a list of names of utensils and implements of the tabernacle, parts of the priestly apparel, etc., and then declaring that they belong exclusively to the Elohist? Still, Knobel has taken pains to do this! Again, what can be made of the Jehovist not using a sacrificial phrase like **בין הערבים** (*between the evenings*), or such as refer specifically to the religious life of Israel, on which the Jehovist did not legislate at all? It sounds strange when we hear **מקרא קדש** (*holy convocation*) classed as an Elohist phrase. Do the critics mean, that in the time of Jehoshaphat, or whatever date they may choose to fix for the origin of the Covenant-law, no such “holy convocations” were held? And, if not, where is the slightest trace of proof that the Jehovist has another word to designate the same thing? We cannot but infer that he had no occasion to use the word, and that this is the one and the only reason why the word is not found in his vocabulary. He does use a similar phrase, however, in Exod. 22:30 (31); viz., **אנשי קדש** (*holy men*). What is to be thought of Elohist words which do not occur even once in the whole book of Leviticus, such as **צבאות** (*hosts*), **שפטים** (*judgments*), or of **עמית** (*neighbor*), which appears only in laws of injury done to a neighbor, whilst, moreover, the Elohist employs the synonymous **שכן** and **רע** in common with the Jehovist just as well? Besides **אזרח הארץ**, the Old Testament knows no other word for “native of the land;” and so we will have to hold that its absence in the Jehovist has no further cause than a want of occasion to use it. It is useless to collect here all the pretended evidence of this and like character, except in so far as it might furnish an apt illustration of the ease with which some critics make the transition from proving a theory to applying it, all the while forgetting that their application, as it results in a *reductio ad absurdum*, instead of fortifying, practically weakens, all the previous evidence.

We now turn to the Jehovistic part of the Mosaic Code. The passages, Exod. 12:24-27, 13:3-10, 11-16, are assigned to it by Knobel, Dillmann, Nöldeke, Schrader, Kayser (Dillmann and Kayser, in addition, 12:21-24). Here, also, it is claimed that the dissection rests on solid literary grounds, which we shall have to examine.

First, the proper name **מצרים** (*Egypt*), not preceded by the usual **ארץ** (*land*), 12:27. But neither form, with or without **ארץ** is exclusively used by either the Jehovist or the Elohist. The former uses the form with **ארץ**, Gen. 13:10 (according to Schrader, Knobel, Kayser, Dillmann), and 21:21 (according to Kayser); also Exod. 22:20. The Elohist, on the other hand, employs that without **ארץ**, Gen. 46:6-8 (according to Hupfeld, Knobel, Schrader, Dillmann).

Next comes **בית עבדים** (*house of bondmen*), 13:3, 4. This is used only here and in 20:2; also four times in Deuteronomy. But the fact that the phrase does not occur before the exodus shows that its use does not depend on the style of the writer, but on the intention of the law-giver. The reference to the bondage of Egypt is urged as a motive to faithful observance of God’s commands; and, of course, this was only appropriate in such laws as directly reminded the people of their sojourn in Egypt (Passover, Mazzoth, Treatment of strangers and servants), and suited ethical commands better than ceremonial prescriptions, which were given to the priests, not addressed to the people in general.

חֹדֶשׁ אֲבִיב (*the month Abib*), 13:4; also, 23:15, 34:18; Deut. 16:1. A comparison of all the passages will show, that, wherever a specific date is given, the month is numbered also; and, wherever the date is left indefinite, the month is designated by the name Abib. In all these pretended Jehovistic passages, there is no specification; and accordingly Abib is retained. Of Wellhausen's assertion, that the custom of numbering the months, in connection with the adoption of the spring era, was derived from the Babylonians during the captivity, we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

נִשְׁבַּע יְהוָה (*Jehovah sware*), 13:5, 11, 32:13, 33:1. But the Levitical law contains no reference to God's swearing, neither is it easy to see at what occasion it could have introduced God as doing so.

The enumeration of the seven Canaanitish nations, 13:5; also, 23:23, 28, 33:2, 34:11. But it is not merely this complete enumeration which is peculiar to the Jehovist, but the idea that the Israelites shall possess the land of the Canaanite tribes. He conveys this idea without the same enumeration, Gen. 13:7, 34:30; in Exod. 23:28, only three tribes are mentioned. That the idea is found with him rather than with the Elohist is natural; since the critics assign to the latter only ritual law, with which it stands in no way related. And, even if we suppose that it was peculiar to the Jehovistic document in Genesis, what wonder would there be in Moses' repeating the phrase? How do we know that he cannot have appropriated some elements of the diction of the documents?

אֶרֶץ זָבַת חֵלֶב וְדָבָשׁ (*land flowing with milk and honey*), 13:5, 33:3. This phrase occurs also in Lev. 20:24. In Num. 14:8, Schrader is obliged to divide a single verse to eliminate it from an Elohist context. This must accordingly be given up as peculiarly Jehovistic.

גְּבוּל (*quarters or borders*), 13:7, occurs in the Elohist passages, Gen. 23:12; Num. 20:23, 34:3, 6, 35:26, and elsewhere. How this can be called Jehovistic may remain for the critics to determine. The word occurs throughout the whole Old Testament.

בְּעִבּוֹר (*because*), 13:8; also, 19:9, 20:20; *passim* in Genesis. The expression is of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament, from Amos down to Chronicles. It is absurd to call it the peculiar property of the Jehovist, since it belonged evidently to the common stock of the language.

מָחָר (*in time to come*), Exod. 13:14, 32:5; Num. 4:25, 16:7, 16. The two latter passages are both Nöldeke and Schrader assigned to the Elohist, so that the word ceases to be characteristically Jehovistic. Moreover, the Elohist has it in somewhat different form, מִמְּחָרָה Lev. 23:11, 15, 16.

With regard to the Decalogue our task is easy; since the critics all admit that the criteria of Jehovist, Elohist, and Deuteronomist intermingle. The sanction added to the Sabbath-command, ver. 11, refers back to the Elohist account of the creation. Also the phrase עָשָׂה מִלְאכָה (*do work*) is Elohist. בְּשַׁעֲרֵיךָ (*in thy gates*), in ver. 10, is Deuteronomic. Wellhausen claims the same for the whole of ver. 6. מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים (*from the house of bondmen*) is Jehovistic. The whole Decalogue, however, forms a strict unit, and the critical analysis will not apply. To assume a post-Deuteronomic redaction, or even modifications later than the final redaction of the Pentateuch (Dillmann), seems precarious, and in the highest degree improbable. Everybody who has no preconceived idea that the Pentateuch must necessarily be of composite character, and have gone through a series of redactions, will not fail to find in these phenomena a striking proof that the author of the legislation employed words from the

Elohistic, Jehovistic, and Deuteronomic vocabulary promiscuously.

The passage, Exod. 20:18-ch. 23, remains to be examined. Here also we have an illustration of criteria intermingling, on account of which the redactor is again resorted to. Wellhausen assigns chap. 21-23 to J.¹ Dillmann thinks they were taken by B (Wellhausen's E) from another source. With regard to 34:10-25, Dillmann tries to vindicate the authorship of C; whilst Wellhausen assumes a *tertium quid*, an unknown source, neither Q nor J nor E, from which this piece alone has been preserved to us. Dillmann, moreover, gives as his opinion that the whole passage, 34:1-28, is out of place in the present connection, and stood in C originally, behind 20:20, 24:1, 2; so that the redactor must have taken the twofold liberty of first substituting the Covenant-laws, 20-23, for those found in C (now chap. 34:10-26), and of afterwards using the opportunity offered him by the breach and restoration of the Covenant, to resume what he had first thrown out. It is alike needless and useless to follow the critics into this labyrinth of dissections, transpositions, and interpolations, by which they condemn themselves, and frequently each other. Perhaps a dozen other ways might be devised to transform a beautifully connected passage into a miserable patchwork. A comparison of the criteria will suffice to convince any unprejudiced mind how impossible it is to prove diversity of authorship on literary grounds. For the traces of B, compare Dillmann, "Exodus," p. 220. To C belong, amongst others, חָצַב (divide), 21:35; צַעֲקָה (cry), 22:22; הַשֹּׂדֵד חַיִּית (beast of the field), 23:12; מוֹת יוֹמָת (shall surely be put to death), *passim*; רַק (only), 21:19; קָלֵל (curse), 21:17. Of A we note the following words: נְשִׂיא (prince, ruler), 22:27; גֵּר (stranger), 22:20; שָׂחַת (destroy), 21:27; אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם (land of Egypt), 21:20, 23:8; חָרָה אָף (anger burn), 22:23 (in Genesis the Jehovist is said to use חָרָה as impersonal, with the preposition ל). The statement in 23:18 has a Deuteronomic color.

In Leviticus, chap. 17-26 have been partially denied to the Elohist. Ewald, Nöldeke, and Schrader accounted for the peculiarity of chap. 18-20 by the use which the Elohist had made of an older Code. Graf assigned 17-22, 25, 26, to Ezekiel. Kayser, not content to deal with the material in such a summary way, institutes a marvelous analysis carried out with hair-splitting *finesse*. He agrees with Graf in considering Ezekiel as the author, and confidently claimed in 1874 to have settled this fact beyond the possibility of doubt. Three years afterwards, however, this theory had been already superseded; since Klostermann instituted a still closer comparison between Ezekiel and these chapters, which showed, that, with much similarity, there were also considerable differences in expression, making the view untenable. With him Kuenen and Nöldeke agreed; whereupon the former with Wellhausen reversed the order, and declared the chapters one of the earliest exilic bodies of law composed in dependence upon Ezekiel, a sort of bridge between him and the Pentateuchal Codes. Dillmann says emphatically that for all this there is no ground in the contents and language of these chapters, which he regards as containing very old, even some of the oldest, laws. The redactor composed the collection from two different redactions of what Dillmann calls the "Sinaitic Law," these two redactions being respectively those of the Elohist and the Jehovist.

Where there is so much disagreement among the critics, it seems superfluous to discuss the numerous divisions of which the majority must necessarily be wrong. The greater part of the peculiar expressions stated by Kayser (p. 66) arise naturally from the contents: some express ideas that occur only here; several of them are confessedly Jehovistic, others Elohist; the whole division is arbitrary and precarious, one of the most striking proofs that the critical analysis, if consistently carried out, issues in absurdities. Often a single verse is sundered out, because it presents traces of the Elohist.

And after all, Kayser himself is obliged to confess that the elimination of the new source (“law of holiness”), though constituting a connected and somewhat cognate whole, leaves the remaining parts incoherent and detached, without any central idea, or guiding principle of connection.

It may still further be remarked, that the denial of the Elohist origin of Num. 8:23-26 (Kayser assigns it to the redactor) does not rest on literary considerations, but is maintained in direct opposition to the decidedly Elohist language of these verses, simply on account of a pretended contradiction to chap. 4:30.

We have reached the end of our discussion of the literary argument, and may state as our conclusion that, whatever it be held to prove with regard to Genesis, it is incompetent to prove a diversity of authorship for the Pentateuchal Codes. It appears that the divisive methods partake rather of the nature of an applied hypothesis than of a strictly linguistic argumentation. The conviction that the middle books of the Pentateuch are of a composite character may rest on various grounds. With the newest school it is based on a historical theory of the development of the ceremonial and religious institutions for which of necessity a literary counterpart must be sought. On the whole, the work has been carried out for more than a century with marvelous ingenuity; and the comparatively uniform results need not surprise us. Given the preconceived notion of a composite character in the critic’s mind; given the two Codes, though closely related, still sufficiently distinct; given furthermore the acute scrutinizing and analyzing of a century, cautiously fortifying all weak points, and guarding against exposure on any point where any tolerable assertion may avoid it, — and who can wonder, that, under the concurrence of such favorable conditions, results have been obtained that seem to equal in plausibility the skill at work in their production? But the fruit, however beautiful in appearance, has grown on a tree radically different from that rooted in the soil of truly Evangelical Criticism. Let us not appropriate theories and schemes, at the basis of which lie historical conceptions, that we can never make our own. The critics may jump without hesitation from a composite Genesis to a composite legislation: for us there is a wide gulf between the two, and more than Christian prudence prevents us from placing what claims to be one continuous revelation of the living God on our dissecting-tables before we have been furnished with positive and unequivocal proof that it is composite. All the evidence hitherto produced is such that it convinces only him who is imbued with the *a priori* belief, that there is no divine revelation in the law: for all others, who repudiate such a belief, it is no more than the outcome of a subtle and ingenious, but none the less unfounded and deceptive, imagination.

(Footnotes)

¹ In the nomenclature of Wellhausen, the Elohist is Q, the Jehovist JE, made up from two sources, J, the Jahvist, and E, the second Elohist. Dillmann calls the Elohist A, the second Elohist B, and the Jehovist C. This last corresponds, not to the composite Jehovist of Wellhausen, but to what he denominates the Jahvist.