

# 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 Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

considerations, not that I might complicate a simple matter, but because I wished to show that the simpler interpretation of what Jesus said has a great deal to support it. If Jesus was rallying His own faith, the narrative is robbed of its difficulties; moreover, it gains a new devotional value for us. It becomes a window affording us a glimpse into the experience of our Lord; and it appeals to our own faith, while no longer perplexing it. For it sets before us the faith of our Lord actually engaged in the removal of mountains, not in the easy way of miracle, but by long labour, and blood, and godly patience.

Faith is infectious; so that if one man's faith demand the removal of a mountain he gathers about him, at last, ten thousand others, like-minded with himself; and between them they may actually remove the mountain by the cart-load.<sup>1</sup>

Even more striking is the inventiveness of faith. It discovers ways of ensuring that the things which ought to be shall become the things that are. Mr. G. M. Trevelyan's volume on *Lord Grey of the Reform Bill* is a fine setting forth of the inventive-

<sup>1</sup> As in the case of the diamond mines in South Africa. In the place of Colesberg Kopje now stands a huge crater from the edge of which men working at the bottom look like ants (see *Cecil Rhodes*, by Basil Williams).

ness of faith. 'The members whose seats were marked for the sacrifice lay back and laughed in bitter contempt as "a little fellow not weighing above eight stone" swept away, one by one, the venerable legacies of five hundred years.'<sup>2</sup>

But greater than all other illustrations of the activities of faith is the supreme example of our Lord. It was His faith that brought Him into our world, and made Him so patient with His undiscerning followers, and took Him at last to the Cross. We cannot believe that in the very shadow of the Cross He blasted a tree and declared that faith could do other deeds similar to that. But we can, and should, believe that He gained strength from the contemplation of the Father's nearness and holy love; and that, at last, His followers, in the history of Jerusalem and of the Church, and in their own experience, began to see the meaning of the words that had bewildered them; and that Peter, thinking of such things as these, writes to his friends in time of stress—'that the proof of your faith, being more precious than gold that perisheth though it is proved by fire, might be found unto praise and glory and honour at the revelation of Jesus Christ'; and 'who is he that will harm you, if ye be zealous of that which is good?'

<sup>2</sup> P. 281.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### The Latest Phase of Hexateuch Criticism.<sup>1</sup>

DURING the last three or four decades of last century the discussion of the Hexateuch turned in the main upon literary criticism, which was prosecuted with extraordinary acumen by Kuenen, Wellhausen, Dillmann, and others; and it is difficult to believe that the broad results achieved by those distinguished critics will ever be seriously shaken. But the amazing discoveries of the literary treasures

<sup>1</sup> *Hexateuch-Synopse*: Die Erzählung der fünf Bücher Mose und des Buches Josua mit dem Anfange des Richterbuches, in ihre vier Quellen zerlegt und in deutscher Uebersetzung dargeboten samt einer in Einleitung und Anmerkungen gegebenen Begründung, von Otto Eissfeldt (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, pp. 108, 285; 115.).

of Babylon and Egypt gave a new turn to the discussion, and criticism began to consider as its task the interpretation of the relations subsisting between Hebrew literature and religion and those two great literatures and religions—incidentally also other literatures and religions of the ancient East. The era of purely literary criticism and documentary analysis was believed to be as good as closed.

Professor Eissfeldt denies that this is so. In his skilful and fascinating discussion of Hexateuchal analysis he takes up the task which was supposed to be completed about twenty years ago, and attacks the problem afresh with a thorough knowledge of the work of his predecessors and a most refreshing independence of judgment. Dismissing at the outset Deuteronomy and the purely legal

portions of P, he maintains that there are in the narrative of the Hexateuch not, as has hitherto been believed, three great documentary sources, J, E, and P, but four—L, J, E, P. The symbol L is used to describe what he calls the *Lay* source, the most primitive and the most secular source of all—the antipodes, whether as regards its literary or its religious spirit and outlook, of the sacerdotal P.

Some elements of this truth had, of course, been already recognized by previous investigators. Every one was ready to admit the existence of secondary and sometimes even of tertiary strata in the great documents. This fact was represented by the signs J<sup>1</sup>, J<sup>2</sup>, E<sup>1</sup>, E<sup>2</sup>, P<sup>1</sup>, P<sup>2</sup>. The existence of later additions to the main strand of P, and of the presence of fragments older than the main strand of J, was a concession which could not be denied to the facts: it is easier to ridicule what our obscurantist friends foolishly call these 'algebraic symbols' than to deny the literary phenomena which they are an attempt to explain. In particular, it has long been felt that there are two J accounts of the Flood: the notice in Gn 4<sup>20-22</sup>, which traces the nomad, the musician, and the smith back to antediluvian ancestors, can hardly be from the same hand as that which describes the Flood as putting an end to every family of the human race but one.

Earlier discussion, as Dr. Eissfeldt points out, had been vitiated, perhaps inevitably, by one or two misconceptions. It had laid too confident stress on the varying names of Deity as indications of the literary source, it had not been sufficiently sceptical in its attitude to the Massoretic text, and—so far as style and vocabulary are concerned—its criticism had been too much dominated by the experience it had won on the field of Genesis, which had received the earliest and keenest attention: with the result that it had tended to overlook the inevitable differences of vocabulary between such a book as Joshua with its story of the conquest, and such a book as Genesis with its background of semi-nomadic life.

There had always been refractory fragments, which could not be readily fitted into any of the great documentary sources, and critics were content to regard these as, in a sense, erratic blocks. Perhaps the most striking of these fragments are the marriage of the sons of God and the daughters of men, whose offspring were the giants (Gn 6<sup>1-4</sup>), and the extraordinary story in Ex 4<sup>24-26</sup> of the

angry Jahweh who sought to kill Moses, but who was appeased by the circumcision of his son. It is the supreme merit of Dr. Eissfeldt that he has discovered, by his meticulous analysis of the whole Hexateuchal text, a document which, quite as much as J, E, and P, runs through the whole historical narrative at least up to Jg 2<sup>9</sup>—a document in which these and other hitherto isolated fragments are found quite naturally to lie. This document is traced with immense care and thoroughness, and with an acuteness worthy of Wellhausen himself, through the whole story, in a discussion which covers eighty-eight crowded pages. One narrative after another is shown to contain indubitable traces of three sources, where hitherto only two, J and E, had been suspected. Or it would be more true to say that the facts had often compelled previous critics to admit, especially in the books of Exodus and Joshua, that the analysis into J and E left some unexplained residua, but the awkward clauses or phrases were conveniently disposed of sometimes as glosses, sometimes in other ways. If, as seems probable, Dr. Eissfeldt's contention is justified, these subterfuges, which were never very satisfactory, are no longer necessary; and in addition we have a real enrichment of our knowledge alike of the history of Hebrew tradition and Hebrew religion.

Triplicate narratives had, of course, been noticed before—the most obvious perhaps being the story of a patriarch's denial of his wife in Gn 12, 20, and 26, of which 20 without doubt belongs to E, and—on this new theory—12 and 26 would be assigned to L and J. On the general principle that the story which implies the narrower horizon is more likely to be primitive than one which has wider topographical relations, Dr. Eissfeldt assigns ch. 26, which connects the patriarch with Gerar, to L, and ch. 12, which connects him with Egypt, to J. In Gn 31<sup>17-43</sup>, he points out, there are three versions of Jacob's flight from Laban, which accounts for the three different cases of word-play on the word *ganab*, steal; in L, Rachel steals the teraphim (v.<sup>19</sup>); in J, Jacob is accused by Laban of stealing the household stuff (vv.<sup>27-37</sup>); and in E, which often puts a finer point upon a primitive story, he is accused of having stolen Laban's heart (vv.<sup>22, 26</sup>). Similarly there are two versions (J and E) of Jacob's encounter with Esau, and one—the older L—of his encounter with Elohim. After a stimulating discussion of the

Joseph stories, in which the seemingly isolated ch. 38 now finds its natural place in L, Dr. Eissfeldt proceeds, with this four-source key in his hand, to unlock the exasperating literary riddles of Exodus. It has long been recognized that in J the agent of the plagues is Jahweh, and in E, the rod of Moses: Dr. Eissfeldt traces here also the strand L, which always seems to speak simply of *the rod* (cf. 7<sup>15</sup>. 17. 20)—a manifest allusion to the rod of 4<sup>1-9</sup>, which, for good reasons, can belong to neither J nor E, and must therefore also be assigned to L. Long ago Professor Bacon, in his *Triple Tradition of the Exodus*, made merry over the inexplicable and gratuitous ascents and descents of Jahweh in Ex 19: here again the four-source theory comes to the rescue. Again it is pointed out that in L and E the Sinai story ends in a shrill discord, in J with a friendly promise (33<sup>1-3a</sup>). It is impossible here to indicate, much less to follow out, the subtle analysis which is conducted as far as Jg 2. Suffice it to say that in Jos 1-12 (where, according to Dr. Eissfeldt, P hardly, if at all, exists)—e.g. in the stories of the capture of Jericho, of the sin and doom of Achan, and notably of the crossing of the Jordan (3 and 4), with its inextricable confusions—the hypothesis of a source additional to J and E comes as an unquestionable relief, and—Dr. Eissfeldt would say—as a positive necessity.

Peculiarly interesting is his explanation of the curious story in Ex 4<sup>24-26</sup> which, by skilfully comparing with the theophany and circumcision stories in Jos 5, he regards as L's account of the consecration of Moses, parallel to the story of his call told by both J and E in Ex 3.

The general conclusion to which he comes is that L is the primitive source reflecting the nomadic ideal, belonging perhaps to the time of Elijah, and embodying, like that great prophet and like the Rechabite Jonadab, a protest against the Canaanizing of Hebrew life. In this connection it is significant that this is the document which narrates the drunkenness of Noah and of Lot, in stories, too, which—especially the latter—betray the rough and unsophisticated vigour of an older time. J, which dates from the prosperous first half of the eighth century, rejoices in Canaan, the land of promise, and in all the settled life of the land. E, which reflects the prophetic movement and comes from the time of Amos and Isaiah, attaches again to the nomadic ideal, regards Canaan as a peril, and, like

the prophets, threatens the people with catastrophe (cf. Ex 32<sup>24</sup>, which does not necessarily imply that the blow of 721 B.C. has already fallen). Dr. Eissfeldt thinks that the place of origin of these documents is in need of further discussion, as too much has been made of the phenomena which point to Judah as the home of J and Israel as the home of E. The spiritual unity of the kingdoms, he remarks, antedated their political separation, just as there was a spiritual unity among the various peoples of Germany long before the establishment of the German Empire, and they could and did rejoice in one another's folk-tales and legends.

The elaborate critical discussion is followed by a complete translation of the narrative part of Gn 1<sup>1</sup>-Jg 2<sup>9</sup> in four parallel columns, L, J, E, P, which facilitates comparison and enables the reader to trace in comfort the history of the tradition of the various events. If Dr. Eissfeldt's analysis is, as it seems to be, justified, every historian of the Hebrew people or their religion will be obliged to reckon with it. This is a most suggestive, searching, and brilliant book.

J. E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow. •

### Jesus and Judaism.<sup>1</sup>

THIS volume reveals all the learning and care which we are accustomed to expect from Professor Dalman. It seems to us that in the First Part he gives a fully convincing proof that Jesus habitually spoke in Aramaic, and he gives various instructive suggestions as to how we are to make sure of understanding the Aramaic which the Master used. We must confess, however, to belong to those for whom it makes little difference to know the exact words employed by Jesus. The precise phrases seem so unimportant compared with the greatness of the whole.

Dalman mentions that he had intended to call the book *Jesus und Judenthum*, and, while he adopts another title, that remains his real subject. It would have been highly valuable to have got from an expert like our author a careful examination of the fundamental principles of Jesus in their relation to Judaism, but instead we have got

<sup>1</sup> *Jesus-Jeschua*, by Professor G. Dalman (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1922, pp. iv. 222; 7s. 9d.).