

WELLHAUSEN AND AFTER

THE GRAF-WELLHAUSEN HYPOTHESIS

AT the beginning of the Christian era the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, as of the whole Pentateuch, was accepted by Jews and Christians alike; and this continued to be the case, with few exceptions, until the nineteenth century.

One of the earliest of that period to offer a challenge to the traditional view was W. de Wette (1805), who adopted the hypothesis¹ that two documents could be distinguished in the Pentateuch, one of which (J) used Jehovah² as the divine name, while the other (E) used Elohim. He assigned the composition of Deuteronomy to the reign of Josiah.

The fifty years which followed witnessed a further development of the documentary theory at the hands of a series of German scholars. By them Deuteronomy was ascribed to a different author, and the E document divided into two parts, the priestly laws and some other sections being distinguished from the remainder as a separate document P. This, which at first was thought to be the earliest of the four basic documents, came in time to be regarded as the latest.

It was, however, after many changes, the revised documentary analysis, together with the associated reconstruction of Israel's religious history, as propounded by Heinrich Graf³ (1866) and Julius Wellhausen⁴ in the second half of the century which seemed

¹ This had previously been propounded by Jean Astruc (1753), but he limited it to Genesis, which he regarded as the work of Moses.

² The divine name in Hebrew is YHWH, now usually rendered in English letters as Yahweh. But the Jews, owing to an aversion from using the divine name, when reading aloud, substituted *Adonai* (LORD); and this different vocalization led to the older form *Jehovah*.

³ Especially *Die Geschichtlicher Bücher des Alten Testaments*, Leipsic, 1866.

⁴ *Die Komposition des Hexateuchs*, Berlin, 1876. For the various hypotheses proposed between de Wette and Wellhausen see E. J. Young, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids, 1949, London, 1953, pp. 126-138.

to settle the date of Deuteronomy in the mind of most Hebrew scholars. Regarded at first as a heresy, it soon became the standard of orthodoxy, and so remained for more than a generation.

According to Wellhausen there were four primary documents from which the 'Hexateuch' (the five books of Moses with Joshua) was composed. Of these the two earliest were J and E, produced in the early days of the monarchy, after which followed Deuteronomy, written just before Josiah's reform in 621 BC, and finally the priestly code (P), during the exile or later. Wellhausen claimed that in the history, as he construed it, there could be seen three clearly marked stages in the evolution of the Hebrew religion and the centralization of the cult in Jerusalem. It was in the beginning a primitive nature religion, when Yahweh was worshipped at the 'high places' scattered through the land. The second stage came when the prophetic movement taught the doctrine of one God, and therefore one sanctuary, which led to Josiah's reform. But the new outlook was not firmly fixed until the third stage was reached on the return from exile, when the priests instituted a sacrificial system which became the ceremonial of the second temple.

Wellhausen maintained also that these stages were reflected in the documents J, E, D and P, and that the legislation contained in them corresponded precisely with this development, so providing a complete explanation of the contents of the law, the prophets and the history.

He called the close connection of Deuteronomy with Josiah's reform the 'fulcrum' of his theory, a fact which lends special importance to the dating of this book. As H. H. Rowley expresses it, 'the Code of Deuteronomy is . . . of vital importance in Pentateuchal criticism, since it is primarily by relation to it that the other documents are dated.'¹

From the closing years of the nineteenth century it became an accepted hypothesis, in accordance with this scheme, that the book of Deuteronomy was a product of the days of Josiah, written with the express purpose of promoting a religious reform, to include the abolition of the 'high places', or local sanctuaries, supposed to have been perfectly legitimate up to that time, and to concentrate the people's worship in Jerusalem. There were not lacking able contemporaries of Wellhausen who rejected his theory and

¹ *The Growth of the Old Testament*, London, 1950, p. 29.

controverted his arguments, such as Hengstenberg and Franz Delitzsch (in the main) in Germany, W. H. Green and R. D. Wilson in America, and James Robertson, A. H. Sayce, H. M. Wiener and James Orr in Britain. On the other hand they were accepted by many leading scholars: among such, W. Robertson Smith¹ and S. R. Driver², whilst maintaining the inspiration of Scripture, adopted their conclusions, and propagated them with zeal and ability. It was a time of scientific discovery and new ideas in many directions, when traditional views were at a discount. There was an inclusiveness in Wellhausen's scheme which gave it an appearance of solidity, and Driver did much to disarm opposition by insisting that the views which he was propounding did not 'touch either the inspiration or the authority of the Scriptures of the Old Testament'.³ Thus the main outlines of what came to be known as the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis secured a firm hold in our British universities, which was retained well into the twentieth century.

The position then reached regarding Deuteronomy may be expressed in Wellhausen's own words: 'About the origin of Deuteronomy there is still less dispute; in all circles where appreciation of scientific results can be looked for at all, it is recognized that it was composed in the same age as that in which it was discovered, and that it was made the rule of Josiah's reformation, which took place about a generation before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldaeans.'⁴ In the early part of the twentieth century the position was so far modified that Lv. xvii-xxvi came to be considered as a separate code (H) which had been incorporated in P.

Looking back upon that same period C. R. North, writing in 1951, described the position as follows:

'Thirty years ago it looked as if the problem of the Pentateuch was reaching a definitive solution. Apart from a few fundamentalists, and an occasional solitary critic like Eerdmans, the consensus of opinion was that the documents—and no one had the

¹ *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, First Edition, Edinburgh, 1881.

² *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, First Edition, Edinburgh, 1891.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. xv. See p. 140.

⁴ *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, ET, Edinburgh, 1885, p. 9.

least doubt that it was a question of "documents"—were to be arranged in the order J, E, D, P, with Ezk. xl-xlviii as the middle term between D and P. Ezk. xl-xlviii and H were thought to be nearly contemporary, the priority between them being still undecided. The seventh-century date of D had been practically unchallenged ever since de Wette (1805) identified it with Josiah's law-book, and the other documents were dated in relation to it. The Graf-Wellhausen theory had triumphed and it seemed that little or nothing remained to be done.¹

SHAKEN CONFIDENCE

Those words fairly describe the state of affairs in 1921 when the 'assured results' of modern criticism were being loudly proclaimed. But even then a change was apparent, and a period of transition and uncertainty had already begun.

In 1950 H. H. Rowley, a life-long supporter of the Graf-Wellhausen theory, said regarding it, 'that it is widely rejected in whole or in part is doubtless true, but there is no view to put in its place that would not be more widely and emphatically rejected . . . The Graf-Wellhausen view is only a working hypothesis, which can be abandoned with alacrity when a more satisfying view is found, but which cannot with profit be abandoned until then.'² So moderate a statement by so eminent a scholar reveals how great a change has come about.

In his *Introduction to the Old Testament*³ A. Bentzen says that 'among the younger generation of scholars there exists a definite scepticism towards the Documentary Hypothesis', and he criticizes the methods used to uphold it. In 1952 Edward Robertson expressed his opinion as follows: 'Since its formulation nearly eighty years ago the (Graf-Wellhausen) hypothesis has been subjected to continual criticism, but although this relentless attack has tended to promote the distrust and to increase the widespread disfavour in which it is held, it is still the regnant hypothesis. . . . The repeated attacks to which it has been subjected by scholars in

¹ *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, edited by H. H. Rowley, Oxford, 1951, p. 48.

² *Growth*, p. 46.

³ ET, London, 1952, Vol. II, pp. 23f., 31, 60f.

the past and to which it is still subject, show that it does not easily cover the facts, nor solve all difficulties. . . . The Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis has served a useful purpose in stimulating criticism in many directions, but the light which it has brought is offset by the sinister shadow cast by it on the pages of the Old Testament. It is a shadow which the great majority of present-day Old Testament scholars would wish to see removed.'¹

In Scandinavia a new school of thought has arisen in which 'all the principles of the school of Wellhausen are repudiated',² and which claims to have given them their *coup de grâce*. Ivan Engnell of Uppsala, a leading scholar among them, says that the protests which have been raised by different scholars against its various aspects have 'wrought chaos within the well ordered but entirely fictitious and anachronistic construction which constitutes the Wellhausen fabric of learning'.³

We must now inquire what has happened to cause this widespread distrust of the hypothesis which once seemed so secure. When a building begins to show weakness in several places, it is well to look to its foundations. The original attractiveness of Wellhausen's views was partly due to the boldness of his attack upon the traditional position and the comparative weakness of the defence. His theory, worked out with great ingenuity and backed by wide scholarship, seemed to explain everything. It was based upon three lines of argument, the convergence of which seemed to carry conviction to those who studied them, namely the religious development, the documentary analysis, and the dating of the documents, for which the connection of Deuteronomy with Josiah's reforms afforded a pivot. Each of these pillars of the hypothesis has since been shown to be insecure, and the challenge to them has shaken the whole structure built upon them.

THE RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT

Wellhausen lived in the days when rationalism held the field in most Continental universities. How strong was its influence can be

¹ OTP, pp. 69, 78.

² These words are taken from a review by H. H. Rowley in *JTS*, XLVII, 1946, p. 212, of a book by the Swedish scholar, G. A. Danell.

³ Quoted in OTMS, p. 65.

seen in the words of Kuenen, 'So soon as we derive a separate part of Israel's religious life directly from God, and allow the supernatural or immediate revelation to intervene in even one single point, so long also our view of the whole continues to be incorrect.'¹

It is evident that there was no room for miracle or inspired prediction in a system which proceeded from this starting-point and carried over the rationalism of the eighteenth century into the evolutionary conceptions of the nineteenth.

Scholars like Robertson Smith and S. R. Driver were far from sharing the rationalism of the German school, but they accepted conclusions which were bound up with it, including the idea of evolutionary progress so popular in the late Victorian period.

The times have changed. Two world wars have shattered the belief that mankind is moving steadily upward to Utopia; and with this change the 'reconstruction of the history of Israel's religion in terms of a simple unilinear development is proving more and more untenable'.²

Scholars are no longer sure that the development was always upward, nor that it was inevitably gradual. Equally great changes have been brought about in the field of archaeological discovery, which was in its infancy at the beginning of the present century. When Wellhausen wrote in 1876 the cultural background of Palestine in the second millennium BC was a blank sheet. The Amarna tablets had not then been discovered, and the earliest known writing in that region was the Moabite stone of the eighth century BC. This made it possible for him to assume that the Israelites entering Palestine under Joshua could not have possessed a written law. It is now known that writing was then fairly common, and that in more scripts and more languages than one.³

As regards the Pentateuch itself, 'new discoveries continue to confirm the historical accuracy, or the literary antiquity of detail after detail in it.'⁴ Ritual practices which Wellhausen considered

¹ *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, ET, London, 1877, p. 584.

² A. R. Johnson, *OTMS*, p. 181.

³ See W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine* (English Edition, 1949), pp. 181-194. The Amarna tablets were found in 1887 and soon made available, but no use of them was made in the later editions of Wellhausen's work.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 224. See also H. H. Rowley, *OTMS*, p. xxi.

as a mark of the post-exilic period are known today to have been practised at the time of the Exodus, and 'it is now becoming a truism that the cultural background of the Book of the Covenant . . . must go back substantially to the Mosaic Age.'¹

It is therefore not surprising that many should now regard Wellhausen's theory of the development of Hebrew religion as untenable.

THE LITERARY ANALYSIS

The documentary analysis still has its defenders, but the wiser of them speak with bated breath, so many are the vicissitudes through which it has passed. From the beginning it has been subject to attack, both as to its principles and their application.

It has always been recognized that the author (or authors) of the Pentateuch had access to written sources; indeed some of these are quoted, e.g. 'the book of the wars of the LORD' (Nu. xxi. 14), and the itinerary of Nu. xxxiii which 'Moses wrote'. Many scholars have thought also that the genealogies in Genesis existed in writing before the book as a whole was composed. But this is quite different from the hypothesis of four independent documents J, E, D and P, each with its own style, vocabulary and outlook, from which the Pentateuch was compounded. For the peculiarity of this hypothesis is, not merely that these documents were used as a basis, but that extracts from them were pieced together, so that each section and paragraph, or even sentence, preserved still the original style and texture, by means of which it could be recognized and distinguished.²

From the very beginning the validity of the analysis, however plausibly arranged, was the subject of constant attack. As early as 1893 A. Klostermann³ criticized the use of the divine names as being an unsatisfactory evidence of different documentary sources, and he was followed by B. D. Eerdmans of Leyden, who rejected *in toto* the analysis by means of stylistic criteria.⁴

¹ W. F. Albright, *OTMS*, p. 39.

² See Volz and Rudolph quoted below, p. 16. A. Bentzen says 'I think we must stop speaking of documents' (*Introduction to the Old Testament*, Copenhagen, 1952, II, p. 31).

³ *Das Pentateuch*, Leipzig, 1893.

⁴ *Alt-testamentliche Studien*, 1908-14. Eerdmans' own idea of division, into monotheistic and polytheistic sources, fared no better.

A series of scholars threw discredit upon the system by applying similar tests to the Koran (R. D. Wilson)¹ and to English authors (Allis)², and showing how fallacious were the results. Grave suspicion, they argued, must attach to a method which failed conspicuously in cases of known authorship. The analysis became the subject of criticisms from many sides. In 1912 two Continental scholars, J. Dahse³ in Germany and A. Troelstra⁴ in Holland, launched a fresh attack on the division between J and E through a re-examination of the use of the divine names, and showed how little reliance can be placed upon this criterion for effecting an analysis. Dahse weakened his case by relying too much upon the LXX version, and J. Skinner replied (*The Divine Names in Genesis*, 1914) justifying the general validity of the Massoretic text.⁵ But apart from this, their other arguments remained good.

In 1924 Max Löhr published *Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis*, in which he set out to prove that belief in an independent document P was an error. He expressed his agreement with the objections raised by Eerdmans, and added others of his own. In 1930 S. Mowinckel⁶ denied that E was in any sense an 'author'. In 1934 F. Dornseiff⁷ claimed that the Pentateuch was the work of a single author in the pre-prophetic period. About the same time Volz and Rudolph⁸ examined the E passages in Genesis, and showed that they could all be explained without the assumption of a separate document; they denied also the existence of a separate P narrative in that book.

They said that the supposed 'doublets' were either created by the analysis, or else were the natural result when the spoken material, which in Hebrew abounds in reiteration, was transmitted in writing. The existence of two, or three, independent narratives, so closely parallel in detail, is improbable. The supply

¹ 'The use of "God" and "Lord" in the Koran', *PTR*, xvii, 1919, pp. 644-650; xix, 1921, pp. 393-433.

² *The Five Books of Moses*, Philadelphia, 1943, pp. 68ff.

³ *Text-Kritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage*, Giessen, 1912.

⁴ *The Name of God in the Pentateuch*, ET, London, 1912.

⁵ Nevertheless, I. Engnell gives Dahse his support (see *OTMS*, p. 79). See also Chapter III below.

⁶ *ZATW*, xlviii, 1930, pp. 233-271.

⁷ *ZATW*, 1934, p. 57.

⁸ *Der Elohist als Erzähler*, Giessen, 1933.

of each 'document' with a 'treasury of characteristics . . . cannot be taken seriously', and the splitting up of verses to make them fit in with the supposed style of each document is a mistake. The analysis destroys the beauty and the religious feeling of the original.¹ In 1938 Rudolph followed with *Der Elohist von Exodus bis Josua*, in which he denied the existence of E altogether.² Von Rad sits lightly to the idea of documents. J was the real collection of the narrative which runs through the Hexateuch; what is due to E and P are additions; Deuteronomy, whilst reaching its final form after 701 BC, contains much very old material, some in its original form.³

The newer Scandinavian school, M. Noth,⁴ J. Pedersen, building on the work of S. Mowinckel and others, is more radical.⁵ I. Engnell not only rejects the documentary theory but declares it to be false in principle, the rules of Hebrew grammar and syntax being violated in its support. The emendations, and hypothetical redactions required to prove it, are but an argument in a circle.⁶

The Uppsala scholars divide the law and the history into two parts, a Tetrateuch, Genesis—Numbers ('P-work'), and the history, Deuteronomy—2 Kings ('D-work'). They recognize that much of this existed in writing before the exile; some may be even pre-Mosaic (e.g. Gn. v. 1ff.), whilst much was transmitted orally; in its present form it must be post-exilic; but a Deuteronomic trend can be observed as early as Jos. xxiv.

THE DATING OF THE DOCUMENTS

The third support of the theory, the sequence and dating of the documents, has also proved insecure. At the very beginning Wellhausen's order J, E, D, P was challenged; A. Dillmann, for example, placed P before D.⁷

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 1-14.

² F. V. Winnett, *The Mosaic Tradition*, Toronto, 1949, concurs in this view.

³ *Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs*, 1938; *Studies*, 1953, p. 23.

⁴ *Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 1943.

⁵ G. Widengren thinks the traditions may have been committed to writing early. *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets*, Uppsala, 1948, pp. 121f.

⁶ *OTMS*, pp. 65, 66.

⁷ See E. J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 132-140.

What is of importance for our present purpose is Wellhausen's dating of Deuteronomy in 621 BC. There are still some, though a diminishing number, who adhere to this date. R. H. Pfeiffer,¹ for example, adopts it for his 'first edition' of Deuteronomy, but the majority look for a date either earlier or later.²

a. Advocates of a post-exilic date for Deuteronomy

A number of scholars maintain a post-exilic date for Deuteronomy, some asserting that H was the law-book found by Hilkiyah,³ and some holding that the account of Josiah's reform is not historically true.

In 1920 R. H. Kennett⁴ proposed a date in the time of Haggai and Zechariah or somewhat earlier, giving several reasons why it could not have been written under either Hezekiah or Manasseh. To gather 'all Israel' together annually to one sanctuary would, he said, have been quite impracticable in those days; any endeavour to carry out the laws of Dt. xiii would have meant civil war, the laws presupposing considerable bodies of idolaters interspersed among the Israelites; chapter xvii could not have been written when a king was on the throne, but only when 'there is a probability that one would be elected' (p. 6), and when it was necessary to insist that he should be an Israelite. The motives for Josiah's reform had nothing to do with the centralization of worship, but he wished to put down the prostitution and other abuses so vigorously denounced by the prophets Hosea and Jeremiah.

In 1922 G. Hölscher⁵ also set out to prove that the book of Deuteronomy had no relationship with the law-book of Josiah but rather belonged to a time at least a hundred years later. He insisted that its idealistic character was foreign to the spirit of the later monarchy, and therefore ranked it with Is. xl-lxvi as belonging to the period which looked forward to the building up of a new Israel after the return from exile.

¹ *Introduction to the Old Testament*, New York, 1941, pp. 182ff.

² This tendency was remarked upon long since by S. A. Cook, 'Some Tendencies in Old Testament Criticism', *JTS*, xxvi, 1925, pp. 156-173.

³ So G. R. Berry, 'The Code found in the Temple', *JBL*, xxxix, 1920, pp. 44-57.

⁴ *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, Cambridge, 1920.

⁵ 'Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums', *ZATW*, xl, 1922, pp. 161-285.

Noth, Pedersen and the Uppsala scholars teach that the D-work (Dtr) only reached its 'final form' about 400 BC, although much of it existed in written form long before. Pedersen argues that the command to exterminate the Canaanites cannot be placed within the monarchical period. Even 'the prophets did not demand that the Israelites should be the sole inhabitants of the country'.¹ Considerable parts of the legislation are incompatible with any period under the monarchy. For instance, Dt. xvii requires that 'the king is to be an Israelite, a demand which could not possibly be made so long as the Davidic dynasty existed, for then the idea of a foreign ruler would be absurd'.²

b. Earlier dates proposed

Another series of writers has urged the claim of a date earlier than 621 BC. H. Ewald put it back into the reign of Manasseh.³ Westphal was certain 'that Deuteronomy alone could inspire a reformation like that conceived and outlined by Hezekiah'.⁴ The early days of Isaiah's preaching, with the political misfortunes at that time and their prophetic interpretation, would make that 'a peculiarly appropriate epoch for the composition of a book like Deuteronomy'.⁵ In 1914 J. Hempel⁶ placed the author near the end of Hezekiah's reign, and suggested that he used as a basis an old temple law-book going back to the time of Solomon, to which he added many of the social precepts and which he then provided with a preface.

In 1923 Th. Oestreicher⁷ contended for a still earlier date, and rejected the idea that either Josiah's reform or the book of Deuteronomy demanded the centralization of worship in

¹ *Israel*, III-IV, p. 96. A somewhat similar view is set forth by J. N. Schofield, 'The significance of the prophets for the dating of Deuteronomy', in *Studies in History and Religion*, edited by E. A. Payne, London, 1942, and in 'All Israel in the Deuteronomistic writers' in *Essays and Studies, presented to S. A. Cook*, edited by D. Winton Thomas, London, 1950.

² *Israel*, III-IV, Copenhagen, 1940, p. 585. The reader will observe how many of these arguments are equally applicable to support a pre-monarchic date.

³ *History of Israel*, ET, Third Edition, London, 1876, Vol. 1, p. 127.

⁴ *The Law and the Prophets*, ET, London, 1910, p. 304.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 297.

⁶ *Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums*, 1914.

⁷ *Das Deuteronomiums Grundgesetz*, Gütersloh, 1923.

Jerusalem. His views received general endorsement from W. Staerk in *Das Problem des Deuteronomiums* (1924).

The work of A. C. Welch¹ is well known in this country. He asserted that, apart from Dt. xii. 1-5 (which he regarded as a later insertion), nothing required the restriction of sacrifice to only one altar. He maintained that the cultic laws of chapters xii, xiv, xvi and xxvi point, not to the reign of Josiah, but to the primitive conditions of the age of settlement, or at least to an earlier time than that of Amos. In Deuteronomy, he said, the functions of prophet and priest, of the judges and other civil officers, were not as yet fully specialized; the rules for the cities of refuge belong to the period of emergence from nomadic to settled life; and everything points to a period before the writing prophets.

These remarks apply to the code itself; Welch thought it probable that the framework,² chapters i-xi, xxix-xxxiv, was of later origin.

Gerhard von Rad has made a special study of Deuteronomy in *Das Gottesvolk in Deuteronomium* (1929) and *Deuteronomium Studien* (1947).³ He distinguishes between old laws and interpretative comments, the former, and in particular the laws of warfare, going back to the original gathering of the tribes round Shechem. He is very doubtful about the 'centralization theory', which rests on a very slender basis; the command in Dt. xxvii to set up an altar on Mount Ebal raises a barrier (*sperrt sich*) against it,⁴ and the various references to 'the place which the Lord shall choose' might easily be later additions. He dismisses the prophetic origin of the book as not worthy of serious consideration,⁵ and thinks it may have originated among the 'country Levites'. It might have been completed soon after 701 BC, the greater part of it being much older.

c. Deuteronomy pre-monarchic

E. Robertson⁶ regards the Pentateuch as a compilation of Mosaic traditions, handed down at various centres, 'by scholarly scribes

¹ *The Code of Deuteronomy*, London, 1924.

² *Deuteronomy: The Framework to the Code*, London, 1932.

³ *ET Studies in Deuteronomy*, London, 1953.

⁴ See p. 134. below. ⁵ *Studies*, p. 66. ⁶ *OTP*, Manchester, 1950.

working at the instigation and under the direction of Samuel's ecclesiastical councils';¹ Deuteronomy may be largely the work of Samuel himself; it contains a corpus of legislation enclosed in a Haggadic framework of homiletic interpretation. He maintains that the address to 'all Israel' would not be appropriate to any period of the monarchy later than Solomon, whereas the appeals for unity and brotherhood and the collection of the legislation would be specially appropriate to the foundation of the monarchy.

Dr. R. Brinker,² a pupil of Robertson, adopts a similar position. He rejects absolutely the older theory of religious development and refutes the arguments for the Josianic date of Deuteronomy.³ For him the guiding principle of Deuteronomy is not the centralization of worship, but the protection of the people from the surrounding Canaanite idolatry. The legislation contains a Mosaic nucleus, supplemented by the decisions of priests and judges made at the different sanctuaries, of which Shechem has a special connection with Deuteronomy. Both these scholars quote the Samaritan Pentateuch and other Samaritan writings in support of their views.

In spite of this flux of opinion Driver's *Introduction* maintains its position as a standard commentary, and it is probably true that the view most generally held in the British universities is that Deuteronomy belongs to the seventh century BC. No doubt many individual lecturers express doubt or disagreement, and perhaps most of them would agree with C. R. North that 'we must be less confident about our dating than was once customary'.⁴

Before closing this review mention should be made of some of the scholars who have defended the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. In 1906 J. Orr published his *Problem of the Old Testament* which is still worth consulting. In 1911 a less known but scholarly work appeared, *The Problem of Deuteronomy*, by J. S. Griffiths, which provided a careful examination of Wellhausen's views. Another scholarly critic of Wellhausen was H. M. Wiener, who wrote *Pentateuchal Studies* (1912) and *The Main Problem of Deuteronomy* (1920). The Mosaic authorship is also defended in two

¹ *OTP*, p. 42.

² *The Influence of Sanctuaries in Early Israel*, Manchester, 1946.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 189-212.

⁴ *OTMS*, p. 82.

Jewish commentaries, that of Rabbi J. H. Hertz¹ and J. Reider,² and in that of the Dutch scholar J. Ridderbos.³ In *The Five Books of Moses* (1943) O. T. Allis criticized the development theory and the principles of the literary analysis. E. J. Young's *Introduction to the Old Testament* (1949) includes a valuable review of the Literary Criticism of the Pentateuch (pp. 109-153).

A POSITIVE APPROACH

The works which we have passed under review demonstrate that the assaults upon the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis have been made by scholars ranging from the most conservative to the most radical. There is no common consent as to what should be put in its place; the dating of Deuteronomy, for example, may be anything between the lifetime of Moses and the return from exile. On one thing they are agreed, namely that the theory which has so long held the field is now giving way, its assumptions can no longer be taken for granted, and its methods can be accepted only with the greatest caution.

All this is largely negative; but it opens the way to a positive approach. This we shall endeavour to pursue, letting the book so far as possible speak for itself.

¹ *The Pentateuch and Hapforahs, with Commentary*, London, 1936.

² *Deuteronomy with Commentary*, Philadelphia, 1937.

³ *Deuteronomium*, Kampen, 1950-51.