

## THE SOURCE THEORY AND ITS DUPLICATE NARRATIVES.

BY THE REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D., Rector  
of Kinnity, Ireland.

THE Higher Critics of the Old Testament lay great stress upon the differences, contradictions and impossibilities they assert they have discovered in the Scriptures. Driver in his *Introduction* (p. 149 and elsewhere) speaks of the "phraseological variations," "the many and cogent indications which the different codes of the Pentateuch contain, that they took shape at different periods of history," "the very great difficulties which both the historical and legal parts of Deuteronomy present," etc., etc.

When considering these alleged "phraseological variations," one fact must be taken into account—the difference of age. According to the dates assigned to the sources J E D and P by Wellhausen and Driver this work, including its complicated compilations and ingenious inventions, was spread over at least 500 years. The earliest of them was J and E, "two narratives of the patriarchal and Mosaic ages, independent, yet largely resembling each other" (Driver, *Introduction*, p. 116). J is the work of a writer in the Southern Kingdom about 850 B.C.; E the work of a writer in the Northern Kingdom about 750 B.C. The first is about one thousand years after Abraham's time, five hundred years after Moses. These writers gave the popular conception of the patriarchal and Mosaic age. Their works were in existence for some 500 years when P was compiled. P's aim was to give "a systematic view, from a priestly standpoint, of the origin and chief institutions of the Israelitish theocracy" (Driver, p. 118). There were many compilers of P, but P in its complete form is post-exilic (Driver, p. 146). P, then, was completed at least a thousand years after Moses and the Exodus. In the meantime, D, or Deuteronomy, was written, "not later than the reign of Manasseh, prior to the 19th year of Josiah" (621 B.C.) (see Driver, p. 82), six or seven hundred years after Moses. Now let us disregard for a moment the many centuries that separated these works from the events and persons they describe, and consider only the time over which their own

composition was spread—500 years. During that 500 years this wonderful literature was created. It professedly relates events and institutions that reach back to the Exodus at least. Accordingly, on their own showing, it must represent the history of 1,000 years. During that time, no doubt, discrepancies did arise in the records, principally due to the work of copying and the transcription into newer forms of Hebrew letters, etc. This was only to be expected. At the same time we have in the Pentateuch, on the whole, a vivid, dramatic, progressive, and connected history of law and social, national, and religious life. Throughout the Pentateuch Aaron is represented as the brother of Moses and Joshua as his successor. The narratives in their broad lines and principles are consistent.

Now let us look at the history of J E P D. P is placed last in the order of time by Driver. But he tells us that "formerly this was assumed tacitly to be the earliest of the Pentateuchal sources; and there are still scholars who assign at least the main stock of it to 9-8 century B.C." (p. 128). De Wette in 1805 declared that Deuteronomy was the most recent stratum of the Pentateuch—not, as had been previously supposed, the eldest.<sup>1</sup> On De Wette's work was founded the theory that "the Elohist had written the 'Grundschrift' or primary narrative that lay before the Jehovist."<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, the first order was D P J E; the second order was P E J D. Then Graf in 1866 suggested that the priestly code was the latest, and gave the new order, J E D P, which has been followed, more or less, for the last fifty years. And during the hundred years of its existence this theory has passed through many vicissitudes—more vicissitudes than have taken place with regard to the Pentateuch or Hexateuch itself during the 2,600 years before they set to work upon it. Its principal dates and the order of its strata have been changed over and over again, and it is very certain that it will see more changes yet, as no scholar is satisfied unless he makes some new discovery. Dr. Kennett in 1906 proposed the theory that D, which other Higher Critics assigned to Josiah's reign, is exilic in date, about 520 B.C.<sup>3</sup> It is very likely that D

<sup>1</sup> Wellhausen art. "Pentateuch," *Enc. Brit.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> See a criticism of this view by the late Dr. Henry Redpath in the *Churchman* (Feb. 1907). Dr. Kennett argues against the Josian date of Deuteronomy, and incidentally throws us back on the traditional date of this book.

will take its place behind P soon, and we shall have the order J E P D. As these dates in the case of J E D P represent principles of criticism, the alteration of the order represents a reversal of principles. We can affirm, therefore, that, while the broad lines and principles of the Pentateuch or Hexateuch have not been altered by any internal or external evidence, this cannot be said of the theory that has attempted to analyse it into fictitious parts. And with regard to details of criticism, a glance at the myriad conflicting suggestions and divergent theories put forward by scholars of every country about the various events, laws, personages, etc., mentioned in this volume and recorded in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* will prove that hardly one Higher Critic is satisfied with the work of another. It is a case of "quot homines tot sententiæ," every man being a law to himself. It was only to be expected that there would be no harmony or consistency in this work of the Higher Critics—that is, in J E D P. It was originally based on a very precarious foundation, the different appellations of Deity, Elohim, Jehovah (Yahweh), and Jehovah Elohim, in the books concerned. The Jews always avoided, and still avoid, using their sacred Tetragrammaton (J H V H). See a learned essay by the late Dr. Abbott on the pre-Massoretic text,<sup>1</sup> and the various means the Massoretic scribes employed to avoid using the name Jehovah. In two hundred places the Septuagint translators of the Hebrew Pentateuch into Greek wrote down a different appellation of Deity from that in the Massoretic text, on which the Higher Critics work.

The Higher Critics of the Pentateuch have now been working for say 100 years. They have already exhibited a great variety of principles and details—a regular "labyrinth of fanciful theories and a chaos of clashing opinions." In what condition of perplexity, self-contradiction and confusion will J E D P be in 500 years? Even at present we are asked to discard our Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua, not in favour of J E D P, for none of these elements are "simple" or "homogeneous," according to the Critics. We have to take into account the various redactors or editors, who combined J and E, and edited P and D. Accordingly, we have at least three sources

One of the "assured results" of this school, namely that Deuteronomy belongs to Josiah's reign, is rejected now by one of their leaders.

<sup>1</sup> *Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments.*

in J, at least three in E and P, and at least two in D, and a number of editors (R).<sup>1</sup> So the correct formula we have to accept at present is:—

J<sub>1</sub> J<sub>2</sub> J<sub>3</sub> E<sub>1</sub> E<sub>2</sub> E<sub>3</sub> P<sub>1</sub> P<sub>2</sub> P<sub>3</sub> D<sub>1</sub> D<sub>2</sub> R<sub>1</sub> R<sub>2</sub> R<sub>3</sub>!

We wonder what this interesting formula will become in the course of another century. Perhaps by that time this critical hypothesis will be completely exploded. Much is to be expected from the spade. Already archæological finds in Egypt, Palestine, and Assyria have established the historical character of the books in question.

The Rev. Johannes Dahse in his article, "Is a Revolution in Pentateuchal Criticism at Hand," translated by Rev. E. McClure, stated that "this source theory has more tender spots than is supposed. The first of these is the assumption that the names for God as we see them in the existing Hebrew text were also to be found in the copy which the last alleged Redactor of the Hexateuch had arranged." He refers to an article he published in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, in which he had pointed out that Swete's edition of the Septuagint furnished in the books Genesis to Numbers alone 180 departures from the existing Hebrew text in the use of names for God. He says, "The number of departures which I noted in 1903, of the Septuagint and its recensions from the existing Hebrew, has been considerably increased by my use of the great edition of the Septuagint edited by Holmes and Brooke-Maclean. So numerous are the indications of revisions of the names of God that in future no investigator who employs the oldest texts would dare to make use of the names of God as a means of distinguishing the sources of the documents" (p. 11). Dr. Toy, the editor of the Book of Proverbs in the *International Critical Commentary*, agreed that "the Septuagint and other ancient versions differ considerably from the received Hebrew text (the Massoretic) in the use of Divine names." He says, "The Septuagint translators, it is commonly supposed, followed the Hebrew text faithfully, and this text is equally authoritative with the Massoretic (in both cases internal evidence must decide the value of readings). . . . As is well known, critics generally hold that our Hebrews text has suffered greatly

<sup>1</sup> R<sup>J<sub>2</sub>E</sup> is the Redactor who combined J and E. R<sup>P</sup> the Redactor who combined J E D and P. Then there is the Deuteronomist Redactor R<sup>D</sup>, and a number of others.

from scribes and editors in the process of translation. It is agreed that Divine names have been changed in Chronicles, Psalms, and elsewhere—why not in the Pentateuch? ” (*Christian Register*, April 28, 1910). Dahse quotes Dr. H. P. Smith (editor of Samuel in the *Int. Crit. Com.*) as saying that “ the works of Eerdmans, Schlögl and Wiener necessitate a careful re-examination of the whole field of textual and literary criticism ” (p. 14).

One might add that another critical test of sources is equally uncertain—the names of the third Patriarch, Jacob and Israel. Driver says, “ J has a preference for the name Israel and E for Jacob ” (*Introduction*, p. 17). This distinction, Professor König states, is still to be regarded as an “ undeniably distinctive mark of the documentary sources.” If this holds good, what explanation is to be given of the fact that in the E passage, Genesis xlv.—xlvi. 5, Israel occurs three times ; that in the E passage, Genesis xlviii. 26, xi. 21, Israel occurs three times ; that Jacob occurs in the J passage, Genesis xxxvii. 34 ; that in the E passage, Genesis xxxv. 5, the LXX has Israel, while it has Israel in the J passage, Genesis xxxvii. 3 ; and in the E passage, Genesis xlii. 5, both Hebrew and LXX have Israel ; and that the name Jacob is inserted by the LXX in xlv. 8, xlviii. 1, xxxv. 16, and Israel in xxxv. 5, an E passage. These divergencies in the LXX and the failure of the test in other passages prove its unreliable nature. The use of these names seem patent of another explanation, Israel being sometimes used in a grander sense, e.g. in Genesis xlviii. 14 ; and sometimes as purely alternative, e.g. in Genesis xlviii., where we have Jacob—Israel, Jacob—Israel, Jacob—Israel. One is not surprised that the critics have differed so much about the sources to which these names should be referred. De Wette regarded Israel as the peculiarity of the first Elohist. Hupfield treated Jacob as the feature of that work ; Ilgen regarded Israel as the characteristic of the second Elohist, and Jacob of the Yahvist and the first Elohist (J and E). See Dahse’s pamphlet. A brief review of the *Duplicate Narratives* will show how these tests have been employed.

As regards the “ duplicate narratives ” in Genesis, of which too much has been made, it is not at all proved that there are two documents of the same event, by different writers, patched together by a later editor. It is quite possible that they are accounts of similar events which may not be identical. Dr. Driver mentions

six instances of such double records. The second account of the Creation concerns the immediate environment of man, and has naturally a greater human interest, and is described in a more flowing narrative than the brief summary of the creation of the universe in c. I. Much is made of the omission of the verb *bara'*, to create, and *toldoth*, "generations." But these words occur in ii. 4, and it is an artificial division of the same verse that cuts them out of the second account. Besides, the Hebrew words to create and form occur side by side in Amos iv. 13, "He that formeth (*yotser*) the heavens and createth (*bore'*) the wind." If we are to follow the Higher Critics, we must assign the first part of this saying to J and the second to P. The Critics build upon the fact that "beasts of the earth" occurs in Genesis i. and "beasts of the field" in Genesis ii. The first is assigned to P and the second to J. Now in Job v. 22, 23, we have the two expressions: "Neither shalt thou be afraid of the beasts of the earth. . . . And the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee." Does not the first belong to P and the second to J? Are not the words in Job a commentary upon the story of the Creation? "The beasts of the field" are the beasts within the sphere and range of human life. The difference too of the appellation of God does not prove a difference of source. "It is true," admitted Driver,<sup>1</sup> that Elohim (God) and Yahweh (Jehovah, 'Lord') represent the Divine nature under different aspects, viz. as the God of nature and the God of revelation respectively." This distinction of name is in keeping with what has been already said, that in the first chapter the great principles of the creation of the vast universe are stated; in the second the creation of human surroundings and human life is described in fuller detail. That name of God which suggests most His relation to human life is appropriate here. Is not the table of contents, or the summary of contents, or the preface in which the argument of any book is summed up, always in a balder, briefer style than the ensuing narrative? Does this prove difference of authorship? The name Jehovah—the Covenant name of God—is also used as distinguished from Elohim (God) in narratives about the chosen people of God, e.g. in passages where Abraham's wife was concerned, Genesis xii. 17, xx. 18. But it is Elohim (God) Who appeared to Abimelech. In Genesis xxvi. it is Jehovah Who

<sup>1</sup> *Book of Genesis*, xi., note.

appears to Isaac. Elohim is used through nearly all the Egyptian history in Genesis, but in c. xxxix., where the story of Joseph is given, Jehovah occurs eight times, and Elohim only once where Joseph speaks to one outside the covenant about "sin against God" (xxxix. 9).

Again, with regard to the name Isaac, of which Driver said there were three explanations given, there are, indeed, three references, containing different details, to his birth, but there is only one passage (Gen. xvii. 19) in which the name Isaac is connected with laughter. With regard to the two explanations of Bethel, it is to be noted that "Jacob's second visit is but the complement of the first, fulfilling its conditions" (Gen. xxviii. 22). Why should not Jacob when he was strong and prosperous confirm the oath and covenant he had made when a poor fugitive from his own home? Does this second act prove the existence of a different author, or of an author who was human?

As the narrative of the Flood is considered the masterpiece of the Higher Criticism, one might examine it first. In Genesis i. and ii. the compiler is said to have kept his sources distinct, but he is said to have woven together P and J here into a single narrative (Driver, *Genesis*, p. 85). The critic divides this narrative in the following manner: vi. 5-8 (J); vi. 9-13 (P); vi. 17-22 (P); vii. 1-5 (J); vii. 6, 11, 13-16a, 17a (P); vii. 7-10, 12, 16b, 22, 23 (J); viii. 2b-3a, 6-12, 13b, 20-22 (J), the rest of viii. (P). First note that these allocations are made according to the Divine appellations, J having Jehovah (Yahweh), and P, Elohim. Now the LXX versions of this narrative has different names in eleven places from the Massoretic Hebrew text. The LXX is regarded by critics<sup>1</sup> as "our oldest authority for the text of the Old Testament." We are, therefore, justified in appealing to it. In vi. 5, the Hebrew has "Lord," the LXX "Lord God," the Vulg. "God." In vi. 8 the Hebrew has "Lord," the LXX "Lord God." This is a J passage. In its supposed duplicate vi. 9-13, the LXX has "Lord God" in vv. 12 and 13, where the Hebrew has "God." In vii. 1-5, a J passage, the LXX has "Lord God" in vv. 1 and 5. The Samaritan has "God" in v. 1. In vi. 17-22, P, its supposed duplicate, "God" occurs once in the Hebrew (v. 22), where the LXX reads "Lord God." The critics assign vii. 9 "as God commanded Noah"

<sup>1</sup> Chapman, *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, p. 273.

to J in spite of the Hebrew "God" (so LXX). Driver mentions that "the Sam., Targ., Vulg. have *Jehovah* no doubt rightly" (*Genesis*, p. 90). He recognizes the possibility of the Massoretic text, upon which his theory is built, being wrong. If the same principle be extended to the above passage, it will show that the Hebrew text was wrong and the LXX right in many places.

Again, the duplicate passages are not duplicates at all. When read side by side, the various accounts are in regular sequence, e.g. v. 8 (J) is logically followed by v. 9 (P). V. 8 says that "Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord" ("Lord God" LXX). V. 9 tells us why. He was a righteous man, perfect, and walked with God. <sup>3</sup>Vi. 5-8 (J) says the "Lord" ("Lord God" LXX, "God" Vulg.) saw the wickedness of *man*, repented of having made *man*, said, "I will blot out the man (Adam) from the face of the ground (adamah), and then used a phrase, "beast, creeping thing, and fowl of the air," closely resembling i. 26, a P passage, and concludes with Noah finding favour with the Lord ("Lord God" LXX). This is followed by a passage (assigned to P) which explains why Noah found such favour, gives the names of his sons, says the earth (not merely man) was corrupt, and that God ("Lord God" LXX) seeing this informed Noah of His purpose to destroy all flesh *with the earth*. These passages are not duplicates. The latter explains and expands the former. Again, vi. 17-22 (P), following the order to make the ark, contains the announcement of the flood, the promise of the covenant with Noah and his sons, and the order to bring in "two of every sort" and "food for thee and them." In vii. 1-8 (J) we have the order to enter the ark now completed, to bring in seven pairs of the clean and one pair of the unclean animals, and the announcement that the flood is coming in seven days. The latter passage is not a repetition, but an amplification of the former. The chief reason why vii. 1-5 is assigned to J is that "P omits designedly" (Chapman, *Introduction*, 80) "all reference to clean and unclean before the Sinaitic legislation"! In vii. 7-10 (J) we have five P peculiarities and only two J features, and yet the passage is assigned to J in spite of the fact that the Hebrew text has "God." Again, in the narrative called P we jump from vii. 6 to vii. 11, from the 600th year of Noah to the 600th year, 2nd month and 17th day without any explanation as to how the interval was spent. This is, however, given by J in verses 7-10.



P says nothing about closing the ark. This is mentioned in J (v. 16b). Can these passages which dovetail so into one another and supplement each other be called "duplicate"? The theory requires it to be so, of course; but the facts certainly do not.

Driver argues that in P the waters prevail for 150 days, remaining on the earth one year and eleven days (vii. 11 comp. with viii. 14), while in J the entire duration of the flood is sixty-one days (*Genesis*, p. 85). This result is obtained by assigning all the dates to P, and only the numbers forty and seven (three times) to J. This is arbitrary, and even so there is a gap of at least ninety days between the first day of the tenth month (viii. 5) and the first day of the first month (viii. 13) in P, which can only be explained by the intervening passage assigned to J, which says that Noah waited forty days before sending out the raven, and that after two periods of seven days the dove returned with an olive leaf. At least three more days would be required for the waters to subside from the top of the olive tree to the surface of the ground. Thus J fills up the gap of ninety days in P. The passages are to be read, therefore, consecutively, not as duplicates. It is also to be observed that there is a rhythmical and corresponding order in the manner in which the waters rise and fall. The waters increase and float the ark (vii. 17b, J.). The waters prevail and increase greatly (vii. 18, P); the ark moves on the waters; the waters prevail exceedingly and the high mountains are covered (vii. 19, P). These stages of increase are followed by corresponding stages of decrease. The waters return continually (J). The waters decrease so that the ark can rest (P), and then the mountain tops are uncovered (P). Does not the literary climax prove that critical analysis wrong? It is not chance but design that produces such artistic effects.

Indirect external evidence in favour of the unity of the narrative in *Genesis* is borne by the Babylonian account which Strack<sup>1</sup> says is "not merely parallel to the passages ascribed to P and J, but also to the whole narrative contained in *Genesis*." We also must take into account the fact that vii. 23 contains an expression which Driver<sup>2</sup> said "as it stands, is unexampled, being a combination of the phrase of J (ii. 7) with that of P (vi. 17, vii. 15)." It is "the breath of the spirit of life"; "the breath of life" being a J, and

<sup>1</sup> *Kurzgefasster Commentar zur Genesis*.

<sup>2</sup> *Genesis*, p. 92.

“the spirit of life” being a P phrase. He said the word “spirit” is here “probably a marginal gloss,” for he saw that its presence conflicted with his analytical theory. This treatment of obstacles to “the theory” recalls the artificial separation of Genesis ii. 4a from 4b in order to keep the words *bara*’ (create) and *toldoth* (generations) out of the J narrative that follows, which causes the J extract to begin in Hebrew with an adverbial clause, “in the day the Lord made,” hanging, so to speak, “in the air,” and the LXX to begin with a relative pronoun, “on which day, etc.”—literary solecisms.

With regard to these extracts, Genesis i.–ii. 4a (P) and Genesis ii. 4b–iii. 24 (J), Driver described the former as “stereotyped, measured, precise,” and shows “clear marks of study,” the latter as “fresh, spontaneous, and at least in a relative sense primitive.”<sup>1</sup> The first chapter has often been quoted as an example of the sublime. There is a dignity and a simplicity about it rarely equalled. Is not such the suitable style for the preordium of the epic of creation? The “recurring formulae”<sup>2</sup> which Driver disliked are needed to indicate the stages in the great process of the developing creation. They are absent from the second chapter because not required. But here there is more to interest humanity, and the style is more human. The omission of such words as “kind,” “swarm,” “creep” from the second chapter, where they are not needed, is no greater proof of c. ii. 4b–iii. 24 being a different extract and a duplicate than the omission of “firmament” which occurs six times in c. i. It is also to be noted that in this extract from J the LXX has “Lord God” four times, and “God” eight times, the Hebrew having “Lord God” throughout. This proves that no argument can be built upon the Divine appellations on these chapters as the LXX is allowed by the critics to represent an older text than the Massoretic. Driver<sup>3</sup> also urged that there is “a difference of representation” between c. i. and c. ii, e.g. “the earth instead of emerging from the waters (as in i. 9) is represented as being at first dry (ii. 5), too dry in fact to support vegetation.” It is difficult to find this idea in ii. 5. The lack of vegetation is represented as due to want of rain. In i. 9, 10, the earth is called “dry land” (*yabashah*). Again, he said,<sup>4</sup> “in ii. 4b ff. the order of creation is 1, man (v. 7); 2, vegetation (v. 9 cf. v. 5); 3, animals (v. 19); 4, woman (v. 21 f.)”

<sup>1</sup> *Genesis*, p. 35.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Genesis*, p. 35.

<sup>4</sup> *Introduction*, p. 8.

Vegetation is not, however, represented as created after man, for vv. 8, 9, "refer only to the planting of the garden, and the making of every tree "pleasant to the sight and good for food" to sprout from the ground therein. Vv. 5 and 6 imply that, as a result of the mist, plants and herbs sprang up. The creation of man is related in the next verse. The main interest in c. ii. is the creation of man and woman. It is impossible to argue with Driver from ii. 19 that animals were created after man. Driver here says the rend "had formed" is against idiom, but in his *Hebrew Tenses*, p. 76, he said, "It is a moot and delicate question how far the imperfect verb with *V'ya* denotes a pluperfect." It would be, therefore, according to Driver, a difficult matter to decide whether the rend. "had formed" was against idiom. The stress of the passage is not on the creation, but the naming of the animals.

As to the argument that "in ii. 4b ff. the conception of God is much more anthropomorphic than it is in c. i.,<sup>1</sup> we answer that the list of actions ascribed in the former portion, e.g. "plants," "places," "builds," "walks," "makes," etc., attributed to J are not more anthropomorphic than the "said," "divides," "makes," "forms" of c. i. assigned to P. I. 26, "Let us make man after our image" (*tselem*) taken in conjunction with the other P, passage v. 3, "Adam begat a son in his own likeness after his image" (*tselem*), appears to be equally anthropomorphic as anything in c. ii.—arguing from Driver's premisses, as the word *tselem* has a materialistic sense in other places.<sup>2</sup> The present writer does not take Genesis i. 26 in a materialistic sense, but mentions it as a clear instance of the self-destructiveness of Driver's own argument. The subsequent anthropomorphisms of J<sup>3</sup> may surely be due to the writer's conception of the nearer relation of Jehovah, the covenant God, with man.

We have finally to deal with Driver's assertion, made also by all the Higher Critics, that the name Jehovah (Yahweh) "was not known till the age of Moses."<sup>4</sup> In Genesis xvii. 1-2, "the Lord (Jehovah) appeared unto Abraham and said, I am God Almighty (*El Shaddai*). In Exodus vi. 3, God (Elohim) said to Moses, "I am the Lord" (Jehovah). Both passages are assigned to P, who should have avoided the name Jehovah, as he must have known it was not in use until Moses' day (!). Therefore it is suggested

<sup>1</sup> *Genesis*, p. 35.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. 2 Kings xi. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Driver's *Genesis*, p. 36.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 185.

that in the Genesis passage Jehovah was "accidentally substituted" for God, but the LXX has *Kurios* (Lord) and the alternations. "The Lord said, I am God" and "God said, I am the Lord," seem deliberate. The phrase, "by my name Jehovah I was not known unto them" (Ex. vi. 3) cannot mean, of necessity, that the patriarchs had never heard of the name Jehovah, and never used it, although they were more familiar with the title *El Shaddai*. The word "know" is ambiguous, meaning both mere acquaintance and realization or full understanding, e.g. John viii. 55, "Whom ye say He is your God, yet ye have not known Him" (*ἐγνώκατε*); John xiv. 9, "Have I been so long time with you and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" (*ἐγνώκας*); John xx. 9, "for as yet they know not (*ἴδουσιν*) the scripture that He must rise from the dead." There can be no doubt that the Jews knew something of God, that Philip was acquainted with Christ and His disciples with the scripture the Lord had quoted; but the point in Exodus is that there was not hitherto sufficiently full understanding or realization of the meaning of the name Jehovah. It is apparent then that the Higher Critical theory is largely built upon a verbal ambiguity,

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

