

5-1-1955

A Study of the Methods of Higher Criticism

Robert F. Day

Recommended Citation

Day, Robert F., "A Study of the Methods of Higher Criticism" (1955). *Western Evangelical Seminary Theses*. 272.
https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_theses/272

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Western Evangelical Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Western Evangelical Seminary Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis has been approved by the following faculty committee:

Major Professor: Edson R. Fuhrman Approved May 10, 1955

First Reader: F. Fennell Approved May 10, 1955

Second Reader: Kenneth P. Wesche Approved May 10, 1955

Prof. of Thesis Form H. W. Byrne Approved May 10, 1955

A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE METHODS OF HIGHER CRITICISM

by

Robert F. Day

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the

Western Evangelical Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

Portland 22, Oregon

May, 1955

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. The Problem	1
B. Purposes of Study	1
C. Justification for Study	3
D. Limitations of the Study	3
E. Definitions of Terms Used	4
F. The Plan of Study	6
II. A SHORT HISTORICAL SURVEY OF HIGHER CRITICISM . .	8
A. Early Criticism to the Reformation	8
B. Criticism from the Reformation to 1800 A. D.	13
C. 1800 to the Present	18
D. Summary and Conclusion	35
III. HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE METHODS OF HIGHER	
CRITICISM	38
A. The Lines of Inquiry	38
B. The Origin of the Principles of Higher	
Criticism	40
C. The Adoption of These Principles by Biblical	
Higher Criticism	48
D. The Methods of Later Critics	60
E. Summary and Conclusion	64
IV. AN EXAMINATION OF THE METHODS AND THEIR	
APPLICATION	67
A. The Literary Argument Examined	67

CHAPTER	PAGE
B. The Historical Argument Examined	83
C. The Theological Argument Examined	94
D. Miscellaneous Arguments Examined	99
E. The Bias of the Critics	105
F. Summary and Conclusion	110
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	113
A. Summary	113
B. Conclusions	117
C. The Suggestions for Further Study	120
FOOTNOTES	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY	128

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Beginning with the eighteenth century and continuing to the present certain Biblical scholars segmented the Pentateuch into various documents as to its origin. They claimed the methods of inquiry and principles, by which they determined the different sources used to write the Pentateuch, were valid. This work was known as Biblical Higher Criticism, otherwise known as just, Higher Criticism. Conservative Biblical scholarship has thoroughly disagreed with the findings of Destructive Higher Criticism but little has been written on the methods or principles of inquiry and their application. Most conservative attacks have been at the results rather than investigation of the methods.

A. The Problem

Were the methods used in Higher Criticism valid, and if so, were they employed without error or bias in giving a sound, safe analysis of the Pentateuch? Further, were they used in a truly scientific manner in analyzing the Pentateuch?

B. The Purposes of the Study

It has been the purpose of this paper to examine the methods

or principles of Biblical Higher Criticism as to their validity and application. The following were the objectives:

- (1) To discover the origin of the methods used in criticism.
- (2) To ascertain if these methods of inquiry had been proven successful in criticism aside from and prior to application to the Bible.
- (3) To trace the history of the development and application of the methods.
- (4) To determine if the methods used in Higher Criticism are valid and reliable for application to the Pentateuch.
- (5) To examine the way in which the methods were applied to the Pentateuch to find if they were or were not used in a strictly scientific manner.

If the principles used by the destructive higher critics of the Pentateuch were "air tight" and legitimate in discovering the sources of the Pentateuch; and, if the critics employed them without error or bias, then the results of the investigation are secure. However, if the principles used by the critics are not valid for that type of analysis then the results are not trustworthy. Even if, the principles are reliable under most circumstances and yet are falsely applied by the critics who allowed their personal bias or human error to color their work, the results are not trustworthy. If it has been proven that the principles are invalid or that they were falsely applied and that their method of employment by the critics affected the legitimacy of the conclusions then the results were fallacious. Then, it would follow that the partitioning of the Pentateuch as to original documents was without foundation.

C. The Justification of the Study

The whole structure of the conclusions of Higher Criticism has rested on certain principles and their application. If the conclusions of Higher Criticism were true then the traditional in Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was wrong, the authority of the Pentateuch was taken away, the divine inspiration of the Pentateuch made very doubtful. The remainder of the Bible rests upon the law as divinely revealed in the Pentateuch and if this be taken away the superstructure has no foundation.

Many have accepted the conclusions of Higher Criticism with a resulting loss of evangelical faith in the Word of God and a sterile ministry. Thus, such a study as this was important to determine if the methods and their use warranted the partitioning of the Pentateuch, for if they did not, then the Pentateuch has the right to be the authority the conservative scholars have given it.

D. The Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to the examination of Higher Criticism as it pertained to the Old Testament Pentateuch of the Jewish and Christian Church. The Pentateuch was thus inclusive of the books Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. Only brief reference was made to the book of Joshua but it was necessary to speak of the Hexateuch as this term was used by critics to mean the first six books of the Old Testament. This so called Hexateuch was used as the basis of the analysis by the Destructive Higher Critics.

The author was definitely limited in this study because of his lack of ability to read the German language, in which most of the early works of criticism were written. The author was also a novice in the Hebrew language, in which the Pentateuch was written, and thus was confined to secondary sources in most areas of the investigation.

E. Definitions of Terms Used

Lower Criticism. Lower Criticism deals with the texts of the writings to determine whether there are any deviations in the text or copy of the writing from the original autographs. It pertains to the words, sentences, and everything of the actual texts. The Lower Critic seeks to ask the question, "What did the author write?";¹ and to restore the original work as nearly as possible.

Higher Criticism. Higher Criticism is not necessarily more important than Lower Criticism but it covers a different field of inquiry, and relies on the established texts of the latter. "Higher Criticism is the discovery and verification of the facts regarding origin, form, and value of literary productions upon the basis of their internal characteristics and contents."² Higher Criticism was interpreted as being the investigation as to: authorship, time of writing, sources of materials, integrity, authenticity, literary form, and credibility. Thus the term Higher Criticism was known in the secular field before being applied to the Bible; but it came to be applied almost exclusively to that branch of investigation dealing with the Bible. In this study the term Higher Criticism was interpreted as applying only to the Biblical Criticism, except where

prefaced otherwise. Within Higher Criticism, as applied to the Bible, there are two definite types of criticism. The one group of scholars are conservative in viewpoint and by their investigation along the lines of inquiry listed above find that the Mosaic authorship and the traditional view of the Pentateuch has been affirmed. This type of criticism has been usually known as "constructive" and was so used in this paper. However another group of scholars have assumed the field to themselves, and apply the methods that have been the basis of investigation in this study. They have so applied the methods that their work has been known as "destructive criticism", mainly, because they have discarded the idea of Mosaic authorship and most, if not all, the main tenets of the traditional view. The term Higher Criticism has become almost synonymous with Destructive Higher Criticism because so many of the critics tore the Old Testament into fragments by the documentary theories. In this study the term Higher Criticism was interpreted as applying only to Biblical Criticism which was destructive in nature, that is, contrary to the traditional view of the Old Testament. Where the term was used to include also conservative criticism it has been so denoted.

Higher Critic. The term Higher Critic was therefore used to indicate those critics who followed the type of criticism which was destructive in nature. This was with the clear understanding that there are many evangelical conservative scholars who are constructive and seek to establish the traditional view of the Pentateuch. The constructive critics are referred to in this study as conservative critics, and the term Higher Critics reserved for those who followed some form of the documentary theory.

Documentary Hypothesis. The documentary hypothesis was interpreted as the view held in various forms by those denying the Mosaic authorship of the entire Pentateuch. In the main the theory was that the first four books of the Pentateuch were a compilation from earlier written sources and that by analysis the portions of the Pentateuch belonging to different original sources can be discovered. The term, Documentary Hypothesis, was used in this study to be an inclusive term to include views based on the documentary theory. Though the theory has been in continual flux through the various forms of fragmentary theory, supplementary theory, and developmental theory, it has generally been held in some form of supposed J E D P documentary analysis.

Principles and Methods. The terms principles and methods were used interchangeably in this study and were interpreted as meaning basic tenets or foundation rules which were used by the critics in trying to uncover facts relating to the authorship, authenticity and credibility of any writing. They were, so to speak, the rules of the game of criticism.

Redactors. The term redactor was introduced in this study because of the higher critics' reliance upon such a hypothetical agency. A redactor was referred to by the critics as the one who conflated the documents into the form of the present Pentateuch. He was an unknown editor who the critics theorized had fused the various documents.

F. The Plan of the Study

The procedure in this study was to give a short survey of the

history of Higher Criticism in chapter II with special emphasis on the period from the early seventeenth century to the present. Chapter III has given a historical study of the principles of Higher Criticism, with an attempt to discover their origin and adoption. An examination of these principles and their application by the higher critics of the Pentateuch was the subject of chapter IV, in which special attention was given to the application by Driver, Briggs and the authors of The Interpreter's Bible. The summary and conclusions were given in chapter V.

CHAPTER II

A SHORT HISTORICAL SURVEY OF HIGHER CRITICISM

This chapter has dealt with a short historical survey of Higher Criticism with special emphasis on that period from 1600 A. D. to the present, was made showing the pre-reformation criticism of the Pentateuch and the rise of Destructive Higher Criticism of the Bible after the reformation. The development of the documentary hypothesis through its various types was shown. The attempt was made to answer the questions: When did this Criticism arise and how did it develop?

A. Early Criticism to the Reformation

Pre-Christian Criticism. Criticism of the Pentateuch was very old, going even back to pre-Christian times. The first evident criticism of the Pentateuch came from the Egyptian city of Alexandria, where "apparently there was...quite a Biblical school, and evidently even before the time of the Septuagint..."³ Dr. Andrew C. Zenos, a former professor in McCormick Theological Seminary, wrote that the criticism of this era

may be set aside as furnishing no appreciable material for a sketch of the development of Higher Criticism. Whatever there is in this period of criticism in the dealings of men with the Biblical books is lost in the manner with which utterances regarding the answers to the questions of criticism are made.⁴

Early Christian Era to 200 A. D. The Gnostic sects of the second century gave much criticism of the Old Testament which was based on their philosophy, that spirit and matter were in opposition.⁵ They did not deny Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch but taught that it was the product of the Jew's god, the Demiurge, an inferior being emanated from the Supreme God. Ptolemy, a prominent agnostic of the second century, in a letter trying to convert a Christian lady, Flora, held the Law to be a threefold authorship, with parts from the elders, Moses, and the Demiurge.⁶ Moses was looked upon as the compiler of the Pentateuch if not the actual author.

Marcion, the son of a Christian bishop, was a member of the church at Rome but came under gnostic influences and taught that as the Creator was corrupt so also was the law he gave. He thought that he found imperfections in the Pentateuch and that the fall showed God as being unwise and weak. Doctor Edward Young, of Westminster Theological Seminary, had this to say,

Marcion's criticism of the Old Testament can in no sense be regarded as scientific. It proceeded from a prejudiced philosophical background...His approach to the scripture was not that of an impartial student but that of one who employs the Scripture to suit his purpose.⁷

There were also Non-gnostic groups which included the Nazarenes, Jewish Christians, who were the first to give outright recorded denial of Mosaic authorship of Pentateuch. The Ebionites also rejected certain parts of the Pentateuch as being interpolations not of Mosaic origin. An example of their type of literature, though later in date, were the "Clementine Homilies", which presented the law as the dictation of Moses to seventy writers but having been

later corrupted by the wicked one. Doctor Young said,

The hypothesis employed in the Homilies for explaining difficult passages in the Bible is in reality that of interpolations made by the devil himself. And the criterion for deciding what is and what is not a diabolical interpolation is whether the given passage is thought to be in harmony with the creation. The judge of this of course is the human mind and thus, the criticism of the Clementine Homilies is really a form of philosophical rationalism.⁸

Another opponent of the Old Testament and especially of the Pentateuch of that time was the little known writer Celsus. About the only knowledge we have had of him was Origen's refutation of his critical paper. Celsus seems to have been an exponent of the Graeco-Roman world, who felt he must defend his civilization against the onslaught of growing Christianity.

Particularly did Celsus criticize anthropomorphic statements in the Bible. God is regarded as a tired over-worked being, as a result of the six-days' creation. Of such a nature were Celsus' objections.

One point, however, should be stressed. Celsus did not deny the Mosaic authorship of Pentateuch, as has sometimes been affirmed.⁹

Thus the criticism of the first two Christian centuries came from outside the church and was based on a philosophical rationalism. As Doctor Young gave in his summary,

During the first two centuries of the Christian era there is not a recorded instance of criticism that is hostile to the Bible among the Church Fathers or in the orthodox Church itself. To the Apostolic Fathers and to the subsequent Ante-Nicene Fathers, in so far as expression is given upon the subject, Moses is believed to be the author of the Pentateuch, and the Old Testament a divine Book.¹⁰

The criticism of this time did not follow precise methods but was

rather biased by philosophical presuppositions and was unscientific in character. Zeno said of the critic of this era,

His chief motive we know was the desire to confirm his philosophy of religion. Whatever books tended to do this he was inclined to accept as authoritative; those that did not he was inclined to reject. This is as far as we can go in discovering the sum and substance of his criticism.¹¹

Criticism From 200 A. D. to Reformation. This period of the Christian history which covered the lives of many of the most notable Christian authors, brought forth little in the way of criticism. This was mainly because of the stand of the united Western Church in the ecclesiastical councils, of Laodicea (363) and Carthage (397). Tradition became the exclusive court of appeal. The long period from Jerome to Luther was characterized by almost a complete lack of any criticism.

Many of the early Christian Fathers, such as, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, Basil the Great, accepted the tradition that Ezra was the restorer of the books of the Old Testament which had been lost or destroyed in the downfall of Jerusalem. "Quite possibly, however, what the fathers meant was that Ezra edited or reproduced from various sources the books of Scripture. At any rate, whatever their precise meaning, they do not employ this belief to deny the Mosaic authorship of the Law."¹²

Porphyry, a Neo-Platonic philosopher, followed in the footsteps of Celsus but paid more particular attention to the prophetic books. He wrote a fifteen volume work, Against The Christians, in which he probably also denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.¹³

The influential Latin scholar, Jerome, in his comment on "unto this day"¹⁴ made the following statement, "We must certainly understand by this day the time of the composition...of the history, whether you prefer the view that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch or that Ezra re-edited it. In either case I do not object."¹⁵ In commenting on this statement, Doctor Young has written,

Some have apparently understood this remark to involve a denial of Mosaic authorship, but such is not the case. Jerome is merely not pronouncing upon the question at this point. His concern is simply whether the words "unto this day" refer to the time of "publishing or writing of the books". There is evidence available to show that Jerome probably did believe Moses to be the author of the Pentateuch.¹⁶

Among those classed on the positive side of criticism during this period were Origen and Dionysius, both of the school in Alexandria. Origen was the first of those who "distinguish between what should be accepted or rejected not simply because it confirms or disturbs preconceived views, but because it is attested by historical and philological evidence."¹⁷ Dionysius, followed Origen as head of the school at Alexandria and exercised criticism of the New Testament books in refuting heresies; but neither of these found any fault with the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, accepting it fully and as divinely inspired.

Ibn Ezra, a Spanish Jewish exegete, wrote a number of valuable works on the Old Testament in which he stoutly maintained the Mosaic authorship, though he felt some verses were later additions, such as "the Canaanite was then in the land".¹⁸

In summary of this period it was noted that as in the first

two centuries of the Christian church, destructive criticism was from without by those holding philosophical and theological views diametrically opposed to the Old Testament and the Christian church. There were no recorded instances of adverse criticism of the Pentateuch found existing during this period, from 300 A. D. to the Reformation, coming from within the Church.

B. Criticism From the Reformation to 1800 A. D.

This was the period in which that which became Destructive Higher Criticism of the Bible arose and was the most important period of discussion and writing regarding the criticism of the Pentateuch. During this time various hypotheses were formulated: The documentary hypothesis; The fragmentary hypothesis; The supplementary hypothesis; The crystallization hypothesis; The modified documentary hypothesis; The development hypothesis; The collection hypothesis (New Fragmentary hypothesis); The new documentary hypothesis.

After the reformation and the overthrow of the authority of the Catholic Church it was natural that some would attempt to do away with all external authority in their new found liberty. The eminent higher critic, Charles A. Briggs held that the reformation was the very foundation of Biblical criticism, saying, "The Protestant Reformation was a great critical revival, due largely to the new birth of learning in Western Europe."¹⁹ He felt that the manner in which the reformers spoke of the Scriptures opened the whole field to the application of critical methods.

Formation of the Original Documentary Hypothesis. It was very difficult to establish any one critic as the first higher critic because the term "Higher Criticism" was not used by those criticizing the Bible until Eichhorn applied it to his work published in 1780. Doctor Briggs held that "The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was first questioned in modern times by Carlstadt, who left the author undetermined."²⁰ In his history of Criticism, Doctor Edward Gray wrote concerning Carlstadt (whose real name was Andreas Bodenstein) and his works,

We may distinguish one small volume embodying the first criticism of Scripture of the sort which the humanists of the Renaissance had already applied to classic literature, and coming from the pen of one of the early Reformers; one indeed who, in respect of doctrine soon to prove cardinal, may have been in advance of all...Andreas Bodenstein...²¹

Carlstadt was a contemporary of Luther who guided the Reformation for a short time. He denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch on the grounds that Moses could not have written the record of his death and yet that portion was in the same style as the rest of the Pentateuch, so Moses was not the author.

Generally speaking, the movement of Destructive Higher Criticism has passed through three great stages: 1. The French-Dutch; 2. The German; 3. The British-American.²² Carlstadt in his work of 1521 started the French-Dutch phase of the movement and was followed by Andreas Masius, a Belgian scholar, who published a commentary on Joshua in 1574, and by a Roman Catholic priest, named Peyrere, in his Systematic Theology published 1660. The impetus of the movement, however, was given by Spinoza, a Dutch-Jewish rationalist. In a

work of 1670, Spinoza "came out boldly and impugned the traditional date and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and ascribed the origin of the Pentateuch to Ezra or to some other late compiler."²³

Thomas Hobbes, a British philosopher much influenced by French thinkers went even deeper than Spinoza in his antagonism of the necessity and possibility of personal revelation from God by way of Mosaic authorship, which he denied emphatically.

Soon after Hobbes, a French priest named Richard Simon of Dieppe, became the first to point out the supposed varieties of style in the Pentateuch which he interpreted as meaning various authors. Another Dutch scholar, Clericus,²⁴ in 1685 suggested the more radical view that the Pentateuch was written by a priest, while in exile in Babylon, with the aid of a redactor or later editor.²⁵ Clericus brought forth two new ideas: first, that Christ did not come to correct the erroneous views of the Jews concerning the Old Testament; secondly, he introduced the redactor or redactors as unknown editors.

Vitringa, an orthodox theologian and commentator, was the first to suggest that Moses may have used ancient scrolls of the early fathers in writing the Pentateuch, having collected them and added his own descriptions and comments. Closely following this, Witter became the "first to suggest divine names as criteria for distinguishing documents."²⁶

It has been common to speak of the era of Higher Criticism as beginning with Jean Astruc, a Roman Catholic physician, but his work, Conjectures, was based on the above ideas of Vitringa and Witter. Doctor Briggs praised Astruc's efforts saying his work,

"opened a new era for the study of the Pentateuch...In 1753 he made it evident that Genesis was composed of several documents."²⁷ "In the preface Astruc explained that he had hesitated to issue his work lest some would abuse it to lessen the authority of the Pentateuch."²⁸ Astruc did not deny Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch but defended it. Thus Astruc, by his division of Genesis into two main documents and at least nine other lesser memoirs, became the father of the "documentary theories". He formulated the original "documentary hypothesis". With Astruc the French-Dutch phase of the movement closed.

The German phase of the movement was ushered in by Johann Eichhorn who, thirty years later, did the same work of dividing Genesis into documents. He differed from Astruc in that he found only five other lesser documents beside the two main ones. He analyzed Genesis and Exodus chapters 1 and 2 into original sources, which he denominated J and E after the divine names he thought the sources used. In his early writings Eichhorn proposed that Moses wrote from literary traditions but later gave up Mosaic authorship and contended that unknown redactors gave the Pentateuch its form. Doctor Briggs wrote of Eichhorn's work in analysis:

This analysis of Eichhorn has been the basis of all critical investigations since his day, and not withstanding the subsequent distinction of a second Elohist and Redactor, the results of Eichhorn have been maintained.²⁹

Karl Ilgen, who followed Eichhorn in the chair of Oriental languages at Jena, held more to Astruc's division, holding that in Genesis, "there were seventeen different individual documents and these he assigned to three different authors, two Elohiste and one

Jehovist."³⁰ Doctor Young made the following appraisal of Ilgen's analysis:

1.) In mentioning a first Jehovist, Ilgen allowed for the possibility of a second, thus it would seem, suggesting that even the Jehovistic sections were not a unity.

2.) In assigning Astruc's Jehovistic passages in Genesis 1:1-11 to his second Elohist, Ilgen again showed the insufficiency of the Divine names as criteria for carrying on the critical analysis.

3.) In dividing the content of Genesis between two Elohist, Ilgen anticipated the position of Hupfeld (1853).³¹

The influence of Ilgen's analysis was that it cast grave doubts as to Astruc and Eichhorn's main documents and prepared the way for the Fragmentary theory.

The Fragmentary Hypothesis. The fragmentary hypothesis was set forth by Alexander Geddes, a Scottish Roman Catholic priest, who in 1792 issued a translation of the Bible through Joshua, and thus anticipated the later view of a Hexateuch rather than a Pentateuch. Geddes threw over Mosaic authorship for the theory that it was compiled in the time of Solomon from fragments existing in different lengths, some even antedating Moses. "There were, thought Geddes, two series of fragments, and this phenomenon was due to the presence of divine names."³² Thus Geddes used the same criteria as Astruc and Eichhorn but arrived at a far different conclusion on the number and area of sources of the Pentateuch. "On the other hand Geddes definitely rejected the two-document theory of Astruc and Eichhorn as 'a work of fancy'.³³

The fragmentary hypothesis was further developed by Johann Vater and Anton Hartmann, both German scholars. Vater felt that he

found some thirty-eight different fragments from which the Pentateuch had supposedly gradually grown to its present form at the time of exile. This struck a hard blow at the documentary hypothesis by showing that divisions according to divine names and style was not a clarified procedure.

Wilhelm De Wette, a professor at Heidelberg, held at first to the fragmentary theory asserting that the books of the Pentateuch consisted of fragments pieced together by different compilers. Later De Wette wrote that Deuteronomy was composed under Josiah's reign;²⁴ but that the other books were later in composition, as they alluded to material in Deuteronomy. This became one of the main points of later discriminations on Deuteronomy. De Wette also returned in his later writings to the documentary theory, holding that the unknown redactor used a basic Elohist document which reached through the sixth chapter of Exodus, being supplemented by fragmentary sources. Thus he was only an exponent of the fragmentary hypothesis and also presupposed the Supplementary theory given in the section below.

C. 1800 to the Present

The Supplementary Hypothesis. The supplementary hypothesis was actually originated by De Wette in his later writings by asserting that there was an Elohim-document extending through at least the sixth chapter of Exodus and that it was supplemented by parts of other Jehovistic sources. Although he rejected the historicity of the Pentateuch, De Wette's hypothesis of supplements tended in the opposite direction of the fragmentary hypothesis and toward the unity of

the Pentateuch.

Friedrich Bleek, in his work of 1836 set forth clearly the supplementary hypothesis. "The redactor who supplemented the Elohist source was," he asserted, "the Jehovist himself."³⁵ He attributed to Moses many passages of the Pentateuch and held to the historicity of the books. He taught that the supplementing was done by two main redactions of the Pentateuch, one before the divided kingdom by the Genesis' compiler and the other by the compiler of Deuteronomy near the time of the exile. The completed work, he thought, was that discovered in the temple during the reign of Josiah. Thus he disagreed with De Wette who held to three principal redactions, the Elohist, the Jehovistic, and the Deuteronomic. The later critics felt they had proved that the book found in Josiah's time could have been at most the greater extent of our present Deuteronomy. Thus they disagreed with the above plan of redaction.

The Crystallization Hypothesis. The inadequacy of the simple supplementary hypothesis was soon felt and the two prominent critics Heinrich Ewald and Hermann Hupfeld took two different lines in remedying the difficulties.

Ewald had, in a defense of the unity of the Pentateuch in 1823, refuted the fragmentary hypothesis; and in a later work in 1830 took up the supplementary theory. However, in History of the People of Israel (1845) he set forth what is properly called the Crystallization Hypothesis.

This is a modification of the Supplementary by increasing the number engaged in supplementing from one to series successively op-

erating at distinct periods. The nucleus, or most ancient portion of the Pentateuch, in his opinion, consisted of the remnants of four primitive treatises now existing only in fragments embedded in the various strata which were subsequently accumulated around them. This was followed in the second place by what he calls the Book of Origins, and this by what he denominates the third, fourth, and fifth prophetic narrators, each of whom in succession added his accretion to what had been previously recorded, and the last of whom worked over all that preceded, together with his own additions and alterations, into one continuous work. Then the Deuteronomist wrote Deuteronomy, which was first issued as an independent publication, but was subsequently incorporated with the work of his predecessors.³⁶

August Knobel, in a study of 1861 followed a mediation position between the crystallization and supplementary theories, the difference being that the lesser documents existed along beside the basic document and eventually they were developed into one, rather than there being two or three definite supplementations.

The crystallization hypothesis took a slightly different turn under Schrader, who attempted a combination of the three hypotheses--documentary, supplementary, and crystallization--into one, thus

There are two chief documents: the Annalistic (Elohistic) and Theocratic (2nd Elohistic), composed, the former in the earlier part of the reign of David, the author a priest who used earlier written sources; the latter soon after the division of the kingdom in the northern realm 975-950 B. C., also using ancient documents...The Deuteronomist in the prophetic spirit composed the law of Moses contained in Deuteronomy, and became the final redactor of the Pentateuch in its present form, immediately before the reform of Josiah, 622 B. C. ...³⁷

The Crystallization theory was not clear cut and lacked the

support of the other theories. It was really an attempt to avoid the difficulties of the former hypothesis by making room for additional supplements.

The Modified Documentary Hypothesis. Hupfeld also attempted to remove these difficulties that faced the supplementary theory, but he tried in a much different way than Ewald. Hupfeld abandoned the supplement process altogether and returned to the early Documentary hypothesis with important modifications. Hupfeld sought to establish three things: First, that the Jehovistic portions were not disconnected parts but formed a separate continuous document; Secondly, he tried to show that there were two composite Elohist documents. This had been advanced earlier by Ilgen and De Wette, as shown above; Thirdly, he said that these were formed into the present books by a redactor, who allowed himself the liberty of inserting, retrenching, and combining according to his own desire. Hupfeld laid at the feet of the redactor any of the difficult passages that did not fit the theory. Briggs wrote of Hupfeld's position on the redactor,

The Redactor, differing from the other three (that is, the Elohist, 2nd Elohist, Jehovist) in that he is distinguished for the conscientiousness with which he reproduces the ancient document, word for word, and the skill with which he combines them in the unity and order which characterize his work.³⁸

Thus Hupfeld followed the chronological arrangement of: A First Elohist document being basic in Genesis from chapter one through chapter twenty and then was followed by the work of the second Elohist and Jehovist being put together by the unknown Redactor; still later the book of Deuteronomy was added by a Redactor. Hupfeld thereby

gained recognition as the founder of the four-document hypothesis which gained many adherents. In 1860, Edward Boehmer, using Hupfeld's theory presented the results to the eye through use of different type for each of the supposed documents--E¹, E², J¹, D.

August Dillman in 1886 distinguished these same four documents, as singled out by Hupfeld, A, B, C, D; but they later became denominated as: P (Priestly) for Hupfeld's first Elohist; E, for the second Elohist; J, for the Jehovist or Jadean; and D, for the document constituting the main portion of our present Deuteronomy which was compiled with the other three documents.

Doctor Briggs classed many critics, such as Ewald, Hupfeld, and Schraeder, under the supplementary hypothesis, while they were more truly advocates of the crystallization or modified documentary hypothesis. Briggs summarized the facts on supplementary hypothesis saying, "In a critical examination of the supplementary hypothesis we must distinguish between the theory and the facts upon which it is grounded."³⁹ Briggs held that though there was great disagreement on the theory behind the hypothesis yet there was "general" agreement on J combined with E, JE compacted with D, and JED conflated with P. Critics such as Kurtz, Franz Delitzsch, Schrader, and Noldeke accepted analysis in this form although each had certain peculiar assignments of various passages and also differed in the form of redaction. However, as Doctor Green pointed out, both Ewald and Hupfeld were regarded at the time as having made a retrograde movement instead of an advance, by falling back from the simplicity of the dominant supplementary hypothesis into a greater complexity than that of the original Document Hypothesis.

There was a movement in Germany at that time to "pay full deference to the authority of Holy Scripture, and at the same time to take full cognizance of the results of the latest scholarship."⁴⁰ Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg was the leader of this movement and was aided by Ranke, Drechsler, Havernick, Keil, and Kurtz. Kurtz later swung to a mediating position with Delitzsch and Kleinert. The Hengstenberg school held to the traditional Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and to the historicity of the whole. They sought to show that the variation in the use of the divine names and the style of writing was due to subject matter and to the person speaking rather than indicating the various original documents. Doctor Briggs appraised this effort thus,

This revival of traditional view was very strong, and powerful efforts were put forth to overcome advancing critics, but in vain, for it died away essentially with these distinguished champions...(and) scholarly opposition ceased in Germany.⁴¹

The conservative scholar, Doctor Young, said of the movement,

Had their words been heeded, the subsequent course of criticism would have been quite different. The spirit of the times, however, was against them, and their work could not stem the advancing tide of divisive criticism.⁴²

The British-American phase of the movement of Destructive Higher Criticism began with Doctor Samuel Davidson, in his Introduction to the Old Testament, 1862. Doctor Briggs classed Davidson as following the supplementary theory, as he also classed Hupfeld and others who really were exponents of the New Modified Documentary hypothesis. This was because he did not recognize the Modified hypothesis as separate from the supplementary as most of the

historians of criticism did.

Davidson's work followed closely the four documents as set forth by Hupfeld and relied much on the redactors. This was his position as Briggs stated it:

Davidson places the Elohist, a Levite in Judah in the time of Saul; the 2d Elohist in the time of Elisha, 580 B. C.; the Jehovist in the reign of Uzziah. These three were combined by a Redactor, 'with considerable independence, adding occasionally a link, omitting what seemed to stand in the way of the connection, abridging in different modes, and transposing pieces according to his own view.' The date of the completion of the Pentateuch coincides with the composition of Deuteronomy in the reign of Manasseh whose author is also responsible for the present form of Joshua.⁴³

A number of other American and British scholars accepted this view, including Doctor Perowne in a mediating form; Dean Stanley unreservedly; and others in various forms.⁴⁴ Doctor Robertson Smith, a Scotchman, undertook to set forth the German theories in his English works on the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and his most noted work, Old Testament in the Jewish Church. The latter was first published in 1881 "and followed the German school, according to Briggs, with great boldness and thoroughness."⁴⁵ The main thesis being that the Old Testament was a product of the Jewish nation rather than God making the Jewish nation what it was through his divine revelation.

The Development Hypothesis. There was yet another major change in the complexion of Higher Criticism. The development hypothesis was born of the Hegelian philosophy which postulates that the religion of Israel was subject to precisely the same law of development as all other religions. As early as the summer of 1833, Edward Reuss, an

eminent scholar of Strasburg, argued that the priest-code of the middle books of the Pentateuch was in reality codified after the Deuteronomic code; thereby then, the Elohist document was actually the latest document rather than the basis to which the others were supplemented or redacted. "This came to him, he says, as an intuition in his Biblical studies, and he presented it to his students in his University lectures from 1834 onward."⁴⁶ Doctor Leopold George took a similar position, except that he placed all the Levitical legislation after the exile, and held that Deuteronomy came from the time of Josiah. Professor Zeno pointed out the background of this analysis by showing that "Vatke was an enthusiastic pupil of Hegel's, and his view is based on the fundamental principles of Hegelian philosophy..."⁴⁷ Vatke postulated that,

the religion of Israel has three stages of development, and that the simple religion of the feeling in the Prophets and Deuteronomy precedes the more external and reflective religion of the mass of the Pentateuch; and that Prophetism and Messianism must, for the most part, be transposed.⁴⁸

These ideas were not readily accepted at first and did not come into prominence until Reuss' student, Heinrich Graf, presented, in 1866, arguments that the priest-code of Leviticus 18-22, 25, 26, and Exodus 31, was from Ezekiel's hand and therefore Post-Deuteronomic. Thus Graf fitted the Pentateuch into his philosophy of historical development, holding that the Elohist document had been supplemented by the Jehovist. However, Graf was forced to make the Elohist document post-exilic by the arguments of Riehm and Noeldeke. Doctor Young had this to say of the force of these arguments,

Graf was influenced by these criticism,

and modified his original position to the extent of asserting that the basic writing was not the earliest portion of the Pentateuch, but the latest. It will be noted that this involved a complete reversal in the dating of the basic document. The former order P E J D, had now become E J D P or J E D P.⁴⁹

During this time, 1862-1879, John William Colenso, bishop of Natal, rocked the English world with his outright denial of the historicity of the Hexateuch. He paved the way for the establishment of the Elohist document as being later in composition and unhistorical in character. His work was rebuffed by able British and American scholars but the Dutch scholar, Abraham Kuenen, was deeply influenced and having already imbibed the teachings of Graf, gave them further expansion. "He taught that the religion of Israel is a purely natural religion; beginning, like all other great religions, with polytheism, and developing gradually into the monotheistic and spiritual system of the prophets of Israel."⁵⁰ Kuenen rejected completely the historicity of the Hexateuch, and held that it was made up from ancient, unreliable legends and myths, the legislation representing various stages, the earliest from the period of the kings. Briggs interpreted his view thus,

The Deuteronomic code is a programme of the Mosaic party in the reign of Josiah, the priest-code the programme of the hierarchy at the restoration under Ezra. He finds three forms of worship, that of the people, of the prophets, and of the law, the later developing out of the earlier.⁵¹

The theory and method of Graf found another champion of ability in Julius Wellhausen, who brought this theory into acceptance by many scholars on both sides of the Atlantic ocean.

The theory as now accepted by a large number of critics, may be succinctly put as follows: The credible recorded history of Israel dates from the days of Samuel. With this prophet begins the crystallization also of the religion of Israel into its present form.⁵²

Wellhausen also followed a particular evolutionary reconstruction of Israel's history based on the philosophy of Hegel. He postulated that Israel's early religious aspirations were "but the spontaneous expression of natural religious impulse".⁵³ Thus he maintained that there was a development in Israel both of the idea of God and her religious institutions. Briggs disagreed with Wellhausen's evolutionary reconstruction but at the same time accepted the result of his arguments, saying,

Wellhausen like Kuenen, attacks the historical character of the Pentateuch, denies the supernatural element, and reconstructs in the most arbitrary manner--but these features are personal, and have no necessary connection with his critical analysis of the literary documents and legislation of the Pentateuch, so that men of every shade of opinion with regard to the supernatural and the evangelical may be found among the advocates of the theory.⁵⁴

Thus Wellhausen's reconstructed theory, known as "Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen hypothesis" or Development hypothesis was accepted widely by such German scholars as: Kautzsch, Smend, Giesebrecht, Budde, Stade, and Cornill; In Great Britain exponents were William Robertson Smith, S. R. Driver, Kalisch, and Cheyne; In America, it was furthered by Benjamin W. Bacon and recently by R. H. Pfeiffer. Doctor Briggs called the radical critics the school of Reuss⁵⁵ and said,

It is evident that the school of Reuss propose a revolutionary theory of the literature and Religion of Israel...In a critical

examination of this theory, it is important to distinguish the essential features from the accidental. We must distinguish between the Rationalism and unbelief that characterize Kuenen, Wellhausen, and Reuss, which are not essential to the theory itself, and such supporters of the theory as Konig in Germany, Lenormant in France, Robertson Smith in Scotland, and C. H. Toy in this country (America).⁵⁶

However, Reuss' form of the development hypothesis soon took the lead over the other theories in explaining the supposed composition of the Pentateuch. Charles Augustus Briggs became an advocate of this hypothesis but called himself an evangelical and tried to strip the theory of all anti-supernaturalism. Thus Briggs disagreed with the philosophy behind the hypothesis but still accepted the results and opened the discussion on the Development Hypothesis in America by a series of articles in the Presbyterian Review of 1881. He was sustained in his arguments by Professor Henry P. Smith of Cincinnati and Professor Francis Brown of New York. He was opposed in articles written by Professor W. Henry Green of Princeton who defended the traditional position with the aid of Doctors A. A. Hodge and F. L. Patton of Princeton.

There was a mediating school, sometimes referred to as the school of Dillmann, including also Riehm, Kittel, Baudissin, Strack and Delitzsch which controverted the theory as held by Reuss and followed Hupfeld in an analysis, holding the priestly-code to be (P) prior to the Deuteronomio.

In the last important work of criticism in the 19th century, The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, Briggs wrote the following summation:

These more recent investigations have greatly enriched our knowledge of the earlier strata in the documents. This is the field in which criticism will hereafter gain its greatest triumphs and reap its choicest fruits. It is delicate, intricate and difficult work, and yet it is necessary that it should be done. Only in this way can we now prove the antiquity of the legislation. It is clear that the present code is a complex of legislation, some parts of which have been taken from earlier codes, other parts being a codification of traditional liturgy and usage.

It is necessary not only to distinguish H and P, but also to distinguish P^1 and P^2 . It is also necessary to distinguish D^1 and D^2 , J^1 and J^2 , E^1 and E^2 , and thus the problem of pentateuchal criticism becomes complex and extremely intricate.⁵⁷

This showed that Briggs did not fully accept the Graf-Wellhausen theory but held that some of the legislation was very old. He did accept the late writing of the P document as come from exilic or post-exilic times.

Criticism in the Twentieth Century. Criticism in the twentieth century has been carrying forth the theories already propounded, but with some very serious reverberations to the developmental hypothesis. The twentieth century was characterized by criticism which either furthered the microscopic partitioning of the Hexateuch following the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen theory of development or took serious objections to this theory. Those of the development position began to speak of the various sources or strata of the four documents--J, E, D, P; thus, they referred to J, J^1 , J^2 ; E, E^1 , E^2 , E^3 ; P, P^1 , P^2 , P^3 ; D, D^1 , D^2 , D^3 .

Those who held to super-naturalism, of a sort, sought for an earlier dating of the documents than those who strictly followed

Wellhausen. One of the critics who called himself an evangelical critic, Edward Koenig, dated the documents thus: E, the Elohist, c. 1200 B. C.; J, the Jehovistic or Judean, c. 1000 B. C.; D, the writing found in the temple in the time of Josiah, c. 700-650 B. C.; P, called the priestly-code, c. 500 B. C.

But B. D. Erdman took an opposite view from the development theory and thought that the "material belonged to four different stages of development, of which the earliest is polytheistic, the latest monotheistic."⁵⁸ Erdman's works were written not only in opposition to the documentary theory and analysis but also contrary to the idea that the prophets came before the Pentateuch.

Wellhausen acknowledged that probably the strongest work against the development hypothesis was that of J. Dahse in which he pointed out, by a study of divine names in the Septuagint following the work of Harold M. Wiener, and the use of the names Israel and Jacob, that the difference in usage of names was no indication of literary sources.

There was a revival of a form of the fragmentary theory under Hermann Gunkel, in The Sagas of Genesis, in which he introduced the idea that the narratives were in reality "sagas" which had been told over and over in ancient times until associated with some important character, such as Moses. All these stories centering around each character were gathered sometime before the prophets and later written together into documents such as J or E which were joined together still later. He taught that the individual saga or folklore was the unit and that there could be no characteristics of alleged documents. In as much as this collecting of sagas

was common to other nations also, it became a study in comparative religion, and is studied in archaeology. Several prominent scholars associated themselves with Gunkel's theory, including Hugo Gressmann, Hans Schmidt, Sigmund Mowinckel, and Max Haller. This theory actually ran counter to the very ground on which the other hypothesis of documents were built. The theory never received a large following, because it was too atomistic and lacked the undergirding of literary support. Its very existence in the realm of Higher Criticism showed plainly that style of the Pentateuch was not sufficiently different throughout to establish it as coming from four original sources.

Rudolph Smend, reopened the documental analysis in a work of 1912. He was an advocate of the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen theory and did not try to overthrow the development idea but simply tried to show that there was a fifth document, which he called the other Jehovistic source. Otto Eissfeldt concurred and identified the first J¹ as the laity source and the second simply as J; thus, he had L, J, E, D, P, in the main besides the smaller divisions found in each document. This was sometimes referred to as the new document hypothesis although it was in reality another form of the supplements of the development hypothesis, which could not exist apart from some form of documental analysis.⁵⁹

In this time of the re-examination of the whole documentary theory, there were seed ideas that if accepted would have destroyed the whole basis. Max Loehr's re-investigation of the Priestly-code, in 1924, brought him to the conclusion that, "The existence of an independent document P in Genesis...was an assumption that rested

upon error. Instead Ezra had introduced into our Hexateuch a writing which contained literary units of medium size."⁶⁰ On the other hand, Gerhard von Rad's study led him to believe that there were really two individual P writings, P^a which was of priestly-clerical characteristics and P^b of chronological, biographical material of later stage of development.⁶¹ Here were two important critics giving views on the P (priestly-code) diametrically opposite to that of the main documentary theories and especially as pertaining to the development hypothesis.

Since the time that De Wette expounded the theory that the Deuteronomy code was written just before the reform of Josiah, this was considered the pivot point of criticism in determining the other documents and their date of origin. The development theory particularly held this to be true, and pointed to the centrality of worship in Deuteronomy as fitting that phase of the development of Israel's religious life. However, this position was severely attacked by later critics. Johannes Hempel contended in a work of 1914 that the editor of Deuteronomy had added the idea of centrality of worship from Solomon's time.⁶² Harold Wiener, by further examination came to the conclusion, in 1920 that it was not the Deuteronomy code, but the H, or Holiness code that was found in the temple and brought the reform under Josiah. And yet another view was expressed by R. H. Kennett and others, that Deuteronomy was of exilic origin in the land of Palestine. Finally even Gerhard von Rad in 1929 disputed the Deuteronomy code as basis of Josiah's reform.

Even the Elohistio document came in for criticism by the

critics. Paul Volz and Wilhelm Rudolph, in their study of Genesis, came to regard E as a "later edition of J, and possibly a product of the Deuteronomic school."⁶³ Rudolph also attributed to J as the principal document most of what had been held to be the E source.

The Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen theory was defended and expanded: D. C. Simpson in Pentateuch Criticism, 1924; By J. Morgenstern in, The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch, 1927, in which he proposed there was a fifth document called K, Kenite having been the basis of Asa's reform;⁶⁴ By R. H. Pfeiffer, an Introduction to the Old Testament, 1941, who brought forth an analysis to show that there was an "S" document, from the name of Seir or South including Genesis 1-11, except for the P document, and parts of 12-38.

In The Interpreter's Bible both Gunkel and Gressman were criticized for having overlooked,

the fact that the growth and development of the national tradition had been conditioned by political events--such as for example, the formation and extension of intertribal confederacies--and to underestimate, therefore the extent to which the articulation of the tradition had been a process consciously and deliberately undertaken.⁶⁵

Doctor Simpson reasoned that if Gunkel and Gressman and those who modified the form of the fragmentary hypothesis were right the examination of the narrative of the Hexateuch as to style "would be not much more than an academic exercise," and further stated,

And this was precisely what seemed to be emerging from the critical efforts of twenty-five years. Scholars had lost their way in a kind of literary morass, their work was in danger of degenerating into pure irrelevancy, and seemed to the ordinary man to have brought little more than intolerable confusion.⁶⁶

Simpson gave Smend and Otto Eissfeldt credit for trying to bring order out of the confusion, by a return to the development theory and the documents; but said their order was "artificial in the extreme",⁶⁷ and concluded that they had failed as had Gunkel, to realize how the extra material "which does not belong to any of the narratives in their original form...had been conditioned by political and religious developments."⁶⁸ Simpson felt that Wellhausen and Edward Meyer brought the solution to the problem by taking into account the political and religious developments. The result of this added feature was that they "maintained that the tradition of Israel had originally known nothing of a journey to, or of the law-giving at Sinai, but had told of the people going directly to Kadesh from the Red Sea."⁶⁹ They wrote thus of J², a narrative speaking of Sinai and the northern entrance into Canaan and J¹, a narrative definitely southern in content, which received elaboration before and at the time of being interwoven.⁷⁰ Their conclusion was at variance with those of Budde, Smend and Pfeiffer, who held that J was of existence formerly as two independent documents.⁷¹

The latest combined critical work has been The Interpreter's Bible, 1952, built solidly on the "framework of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis",⁷² whose authors held low regard for the historicity of the Pentateuch. For example James Muilenburg wrote:

Until recent times, therefore, the majority of scholars have felt impelled to treat the accounts in the Pentateuch as unreliable to a considerable degree for the historical period which they describe...Today many scholars recognize a substantial amount of genuine historical material for such a period as the age of the patriarchs...Yet it is important not to exaggerate the situation as we meet

it in the Pentateuch. It is obvious...that the point of view of the compilers has left its stamp upon their compilations...It is not too much to say, however, that all the sources, late as well as early, preserve an appreciable amount of ancient and trustworthy tradition.⁷³

But all has not been smooth on the sea of criticism, as indicated by recent articles in current magazines. A sample of the doubt of the whole position was reflected by a statement of E. L. Allen in the "Review of Religion" who wrote, "A school has arisen in Scandinavia that accuses Wellhausen of importing Hegelian dialectic into the study of the O. T. and proposes to undo all that has been done under his guidance."⁷⁴ This was voiced by a man considered as a higher critic of standing and published by the Columbia University Press.

D. Summary and Conclusion

Criticism of the Pentateuch before the reformation was from without the Church and Judaism and indulged in for the purpose of confirming the critic's own philosophy or religion. The Reformation laid the foundation for criticism of the Bible by bringing the release from the dominant authority of the Roman Catholic Church. However, the reformers were so concerned over the theological issues that they had little time for critical study. The modern criticism of the Pentateuch actually commenced with Carlstadt in 1521, but received little attention until two hundred years ago when Astruc showed to the world his division of Genesis according to supposed original documents, based on the variation in use of divine names.

During the past two centuries higher criticism has passed through seven major hypotheses, besides the minor theories, but the higher critics have not been able to agree on the analysis of the Pentateuch into concrete documents nor to settle on a proven hypothesis. Though most Biblical scholars who disregard Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, accept some form of the documentary theory of the relationship of J, E, D, P, yet there is wide variance and disagreement as to what constitute the documents and their dates. Late criticism has been pushing the dates of the documents earlier, locating other documents, and have sown seed ideas that would in reality undermine the whole documentary theory. The Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen Developmental hypothesis being the dominant theory of the mid-twentieth century has undergone serious doubts, because of the great archeological discoveries of this century, which point to a contradiction of the development theory. In the light of this the critic E. L. Allen said of modern students,

They will be impressed by the fact that biblical studies resemble nothing so much as one of those troublesome countries in which rebellion breaks out as soon as a stable regime has been established. Today, for example, we are far less confident than we were a generation ago that all problems of Pentateuchal criticism are to be solved in terms of J, E, D, P, with or without numerals attached.⁷⁵

Conclusion. Much of the work of higher criticism has been based upon the rationalism of Hobbes and the revolutionary philosophy of Hegel. Especially has the development hypothesis been built on Hegelian philosophy, which rejects all super-naturalism. There were those, such as Charles Briggs, who accepted the literary anal-

ysis and documental arrangement of the developmental hypothesis but at the same time held to supernaturalism, which is a contradiction. Some of the analysis of Destructive Higher Criticism was done in order to fit into preconceived hypotheses without following clear methods. An example of such was Briggs comment of,

Wellhausen, like Kuenen, attacks the historical character of the Pentateuch, denies the supernatural element, and reconstructs in the most arbitrary manner...⁷⁶

Others followed certain methods of criticism for investigation and attempted to stand by the results of the inquiry; these methods have been discussed in chapter III.

The words of Professor Zeno are appropriate to close this chapter,

The theories which have come into vogue have varied so much and changed so rapidly, that for any of them to claim this exclusive right--to furnish the basis of use--is premature and arrogant.⁷⁷

CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE METHODS OF HIGHER CRITICISM

This chapter has given a survey of the methods used by certain Higher Critics to investigate the authorship, time of writing, and sources of materials, of the Bible. The chapter has also covered the lines of inquiry that these critics endeavored to follow and the origin and development of the methods or principles used.

A. The Lines of Inquiry

Doctor Charles Briggs, a foremost critic of the 19th century, stated that there were clear lines of inquiry established by the critics of non-Biblical literatures "before the higher criticism of the Scriptures had fairly begun."⁷⁸ Doctor Briggs gave Du Pin, the learned Roman Catholic scholar, whom he called the master literary critic of his time, credit for a clear statement of these questions of inquiry. Du Pin had formulated these lines of inquiry in his work of 1691 on ecclesiastical writings.⁷⁹ Briggs gave the following synopsis of the questions phrased by Du Pin, that were to be determined in any criticism of ancient writings:

(1) As to the Integrity of the Writings. Is the writing the work of a single author or is it a collection of writings of different authors? Is it in its original condition, or has it been edited or interpolated by later writers? Can the parts be discriminated, the original form of writing determined, and

the different steps in interpolation and editing traced?

(2) As to the Authenticity of the Writing. Is the writing anonymous, pseudonymous, or does it bear the author's name? If the author's name is given, is the title genuine or is it forgery? What reliance can be placed upon tradition with regard to the authorship of anonymous writings?

(3) As to Literary Features? What is the style of the author, his method of composition? What literary form does he assume, poetry or prose, and what variety of these general forms?

(4) As to the Credibility of the Writings. Is the writing reliable? Do its statements accord with the truth or are they colored and warped by prejudice, superstition, or reliance upon insufficient or unworthy testimony? What character does the author bear as to prudence, good judgment, fairness, integrity, and critical sagacity?⁸⁰

In what measure these were taken from Du Pin's work and then enlarged upon by Doctor Briggs it was impossible to determine without the primary source to examine. These were presented as being the standard questions of investigation used by higher critics, both secular and Biblical, from the beginning of the 17th century to the present.

The question of the integrity of a writing has been handled by both Lower and Higher Criticism but the difference was in the approach to the problem. Lower Criticism tried to determine what interpolations there might be by means of comparisons of existing texts; however Higher Criticism tried to determine the answer by the internal evidence, to discover if writings showed the markings of more than one author, or were tampered with, or edited. These were legitimate inquiries into literary works where there was sufficient writing and history to set up a standard of comparison and contrast. This was a tremendous task that needs more than supposition, impli-

cations, or circumstantial evidence to bring in all the solutions. It was an assumption on the part of Du Pin that there was enough historical data to determine these points of inquiry in regard to any writing. There were actually only two sources of obtaining the answers to the questions, namely external or internal. Of course, authenticated external sources would have been of immeasurable value in any research connected with the Bible. However, Zeno's statement on external evidence must stand,

But the value of this principle (external history) is lost when we take into account the fact that such testimony is available only in rare instances with reference to ancient and medieval literary productions, and is utterly lacking as far as the books of the Bible are concerned. History, as far as it is external to these books, tells us nothing directly about their origin. As far as it throws light indirectly on the periods and regions within which they may have originated, it is not within the scope of criticism but of archeology to examine the information secured.⁶¹

As the critics did not have external evidence on which to investigate the Bible, especially the Pentateuch, it was necessary to rely entirely on internal evidence. Doctor Briggs spoke of external evidence concerning the different books of the Bible but in so doing he referred to the use of silence of one book of the Bible as to material in another and this was essentially internal evidence for the Pentateuch and, in fact, the Bible must be considered in total. In this study any reference between books of the Bible was considered internal.

B. The Origin of the Principles of Higher Criticism

Higher Criticism and its methods of inquiry first appeared in

the secular field, in connection with classical and ecclesiastical writings. Although Higher Criticism became almost synonymous with a negative critical approach to the Old Testament Introduction, actually Higher Criticism and Biblical Higher Criticism were two different fields of study, the latter having been built on the former. As Zeno explained it,

There may exist and actually exists a Higher Criticism of the classics, of the Vedas, of the patristic literature, etc. It is not always known under the same name, but always has the same ends in view, viz., the discovery of the facts regarding the origin, form, and value of the writings under examination in each case. Naturally its application has depended somewhat on the nature of the special sphere in which it has been made; and the results have differed very much, according to the amount and kind of evidence in existence in each case.⁸²

Higher Criticism arose in the secular field to determine the validity of the authorship, material used, and data as given in the writings of antiquity. There can be no objection to legitimate inquiry into the form, the origin and value of literary productions. But what were the criteria on which the criticism was based? Several of the critics mentioned that the principles have been used by scholars in the examination of other writings of antiquity. Doctor Edward Gray, who made a thorough study of criticism, wrote of the first criticism of the scriptures by Carlsbad, that it was "of the sort which humanists of Renaissance had already applied to classical literature".⁸³

Doctor Briggs put great stock in the principles, saying,

These lines of evidence are used in the Higher Criticism of all kinds of literature. They were tested and verified in the study of Greek and Roman literature, and of the ecclesiastical writers of the Church, long before any Biblical

scholar used them in his studies of Holy Scripture.⁸⁴

The author was not able to find primary sources of Higher Criticism of the type that Doctor Briggs mentioned to ascertain if the methods had been "verified" in the use in that field of inquiry. Doctor Briggs gave two examples of the application of these principles to non-Biblical literature: First, in regard to showing that the Apostles' Creed was a developed creed rather than from the hands of the Apostles; Secondly, in Bentley's investigation of Epistles of Phalaris, showing that it was a late forgery. However, both of these investigations were carried on after Biblical criticism had been established, the former in 1877 and the latter in 1883.

Two quotes from well established reputable literary critics of the secular literature of today showed that it was questionable that the principles have been verified. The two eminent critics, Rene Wellek and Austin Warren, wrote in the Theory of Literature,

With many authors the question of a canon of their work arises. The eighteenth century discovered that a large part of what had been included in printed editions of Chaucer's work...cannot be Chaucer's authentic work. Even today the canon of Shakespeare's work is far from settled. The pendulum seems to have swung to the other extreme from the time when August Wilhelm Schlegel argued with strange confidence that all the apocrypha are Shakespeare's genuine work. Recently, J. M. Robertson has been the most outstanding proponent of the "disintegration of Shakespeare", a view which would leave Shakespeare with little more than the authorship of a few scenes in the best-known plays. According to this school of thought, even Julius Caesar and the Merchant of Venice are supposed to be nothing but a hotchpotch of passages by Marlowe, Greene, Peele, Kyd, and several other playwrights of the time. Robertson's method consists largely in tracing little verbal tags, discovering inconsis-

tencies and literary parallels. The method is extremely uncertain and willful.

.....
 Similar difficulties arise in attempts to ascertain authorship where, in the absence of external evidence, a definite traditional manner and uniform style make detection extremely difficult...Gudny Yule, a statistician and actuary, has used very complex mathematical methods to study the vocabulary of writers like Thomas A. Kempis in order to establish the common authorship of several manuscripts. Stylistic methods, if patiently developed, can supply evidence which though falling short of complete certainty, makes identification highly probable.⁸⁵

These two critics, at least, did not feel that the principles gave sound analysis in all cases of application. They also warned against criticism which inconsequential criteria assumed regular repetition to be inconsistent parallels. They also gave evidence that the principles were applicable only where there were "several manuscripts" from which to glean a style of writing. And then, the results were only "probable".

In order to find the solutions to the questions of inquiry, Du Pin worked out a series of four principles or methods. Whether this was the first attempt to set up established rules for finding the facts needed to answer the questions was not certain. The sum and substance of these principles has been used by critics of the Old Testament even unto today. Du Pin felt criticism of ancient writings to be very important as seen by the following paragraph:

Criticism is a kind of torch, that lights and conducts us in the obscure tracts of antiquity, by making us to distinguish truth from falsehood, history from falsehood, history from fable, and antiquity from novelty. It is by this means, that in our times we have disengaged ourselves from a definite number of very common errors, into which our fathers fell for want of examining things by the rules of true criticism. For 'tis a sur-

prising thing to consider how many spurious books we find in antiquity; nay, even in the first ages of the Church.⁸⁶

From this statement it was seen that Du Pin formulated the principles to tell the true writings from the false, not to dissect writings or to determine the sources the author or authors used. Furthermore, he dealt with writings that could be tested by comparison and contrast with current works. Du Pin did not apply his principles to the Bible. When asked why he did not apply these principles to the Pentateuch, Du Pin replied:

A man may say, that all these rules which I have laid down, are convincing and probable in different degrees, but that the sovereign and principal rule is the judgment of equity and prudence, which instructs us to balance the reasons of this and 'other side, in distinctly considering the conjectures that are made of both sides. Now this is the general rule of Rational Criticism and we abuse all the rest if we don't chiefly make use of this...Moses was author of the first five books of the Pentateuch (except sundry interpolations)...⁸⁷

The first principle set up by Du Pin concerned with the internal evidences which pointed to the time in which it might have been written.

Time. Time is one of the most certain proofs: For nothing more evidently shows that a book cannot belong to that time wherein it is pretended to have been written, than when we find in it some marks of a later date. These marks, in the first place, are false dates; for 'tis an ordinary thing for imposters, that are generally ignorant, to date a book after the death of the author to whom they ascribe it, or the person to whom they ascribe it, or of the person to whom it is dedicated, or written; and even when they fix the time right, yet they often mistake in the names of the consuls, or in some other circumstances; All which are in-

vincible proofs that he that dated this book did not live at that time. Secondly, impostors very often speak of men that lived long after the death of those persons to whom they attribute those spurious discourses, or they speak of history of some passages that happened afterwards, or they speak of cities and people that were unknown at the time, when those authors wrote,...or lastly, they cite authors that wrote and lived after those whom they make to mention them.⁸⁸

This was a sound principle when used under proper conditions and without bias. In order to use this principle at its true value one would have to know the history of the whole period very well from external sources that were positive. No author can be called a "forger" on circumstantial evidence, bias, or supposition. This was a principle that could be used when all the facts were in and not until then.

Style. Du Pin's second principle was concerned with the style of the writings:

In short, stile is a sort of touchstone, that discovers the truth of falsehood of books; because it is impossible to imitate the stile of any author so perfectly as that there will not be a great deal of difference. By the stile, we are not only to understand the bare words and terms which are easily imitated; but also the turn of the discourse, the manner of writing, the elocution, the figures, and the method: All which particulars, it is a difficult matter so to counterfeit as to prevent a discovery. There are, for instance, certain authors, whose stile is easily known, and which it is a impossible to imitate: We ought not, however, always to reject a book upon a slight difference of stile, without any other proofs; because it often happens that authors write differently, in different times: Neither ought we immediately to receive a book as genuine, upon the bare resemblance of stile, when there are other proofs of its being spurious; because it may so happen, that an ingenious man may

sometimes counterfeit the style of an author, especially in discourses which are not very long. But the difference and resemblance of style may be so remarkable sometimes, as to be convincing proof, either of truth or falsehood.⁸⁹

From the phrasing of this principle it was clear that Du Pin did not have reference to making distinctions between the portions of a book but in the comparison of one work to several other books of known authorship. Du Pin meant that an author's style could be made probable from his known works and this standard then be used to judge unknown or questionable works. Even with this thought in mind he recognized that some authors vary a great deal in writing and that therefore it was not sure evidence of variation of authorship. He stated that there it must be a remarkable difference to be "convincing proof" of falsehood or pseudonymous writing.

Viewpoints and Opinions. Du Pin's third principle dealt with the viewpoints and opinions expressed in a book or discourse, or the way of expressing a concept.

The opinions or things contained in a book, do likewise discover the forgery of it: (1) When we find some opinions there, that were not maintained till a long time after the author, whose name it bears. (2) When we find some terms made use of, to explain these doctrines, which were not customary till after his death. (3) When the author opposes errors, as extant in his own time, that did not spring up till afterwards. (4) When he describes ceremonies, rites and customs that were not in use in his time. (5) When we find some opinions in these spurious discourses, that are contrary to those that are to be found in other books, which unquestionably belong to that author. (6) When he treats of matters that were never spoken of in the time when the real author was alive. (7) When he relates histories that are manifestly fabulous.⁹⁰

When facts of this character were established by exact comparison with other known writings by the supposed author and with well established opinions, viewpoints, and conceptions in historically authenticated writings, the internal evidence certainly raised questions as to the authorship and integrity. These facts of viewpoint and opinion are subjective in character and very difficult to substantiate as Du Pin vouched. Under this one principle he covered actually two main things: First, the ideas of a writer and the manner in which he expressed them--(1) (2) and (5); Secondly, another phase of the historical aspect of the writing under (3) (4) and (7).

External Proofs. Du Pin's fourth principle was based on external evidence, such as the citation or lack of citation, called silence, by the works of other known authors.

The external proofs are, in the first place taken from ancient manuscripts; in which either we do not find the name of an author: or else we find that of another: The more ancient or correct they are, the more we ought to value them. Secondly, from the testimony or silence of ancient authors; from their testimony, I say, when they formally reject a writing as spurious, or when they attribute it to some other author; or from their silence when they do not speak of it, though they have occasion to mention it: This argument, which is commonly called a negative one, is oftentimes of very great weight. When, for example, we find, that several entire books which are attributed to one of the ancients, are unknown to all antiquity: When all those persons that have spoken of the works of an author, and besides, have made catalogues of them, never mention such a particular discourse: When a book that would have been serviceable to the Catholics has never been cited by them, who both might and ought to have cited it, as having a fair occasion to do it, 'tis extremely probable that it is supposititious. It is very certain that this

is enough to make any book doubtful, if it was never cited by any of the ancients; and in that case it must have very authentic characters of antiquity, before it ought to be received without contradiction. And on the other hand, if there should be never so few conjectures of its not being genuine, yet these, together with the silence of the ancients, will be sufficient to oblige us to believe it to be a forgery.⁹¹

As Du Pin gave the principle it referred then to evidence shown by the citation of the writing in question in the listings of works by ancient catalogers. It was noted that he had in mind whole works and not individual paragraphs, or sections of any work. The importance given to the silence of catalogers on the reference of any work was only credited if the silence was total and it was certain that there was a genuine reason for listing the work along with others. If there was total silence and reason for believing it should have been listed the result was not positive proof of its non-existence or work of another author but yielded only implications. It is readily seen that the principle in this form was not adaptable to Biblical criticism for there were no lists of books in the time of the Pentateuch. The whole of the Pentateuch was included in the earliest catalogues on record.

C. The Adoption of These Principles by Biblical Higher Criticism

Since there were no external sources by which to judge the Pentateuch the self-assuming Higher Criticism of destructive nature rested entirely on the supposed internal evidence. The case of Pentateuchal criticism rested then on formulating the evidences for

or against the accepted traditional position of Mosaic authorship, and its necessary time element. This Higher Criticism attempted to use the existing principles of criticism in determining the phenomena which served as a basis for forming an estimate of the authorship, date, and historical setting of the Pentateuch. They adopted the methods of inquiry in such a manner as to point out two types of phenomena. First, the more formal structural phenomena of diction, style, and phraseology; and secondly, that of substantive character as historical content, theological concepts, and allusions to rites and ceremonies. Actually Biblical criticism did not adopt verbatim the principles as expressed in former criticism nor did the critics of the Bible apply in totality in the beginning the manner of investigation which the humanist had applied to the classical writings and Du Pin to the ecclesiastical. The reasons for this were self-evident, mainly because the Pentateuch as received, was a unit set apart by itself. The most natural way would have been to compare Genesis with Exodus, Genesis-Exodus with Leviticus, and the result with Deuteronomy. Secondly, there was the fact that the Bible was "sacred" ground for the public and criticism had to advance slowly to keep from the wrath of an outraged people. Biblical criticism developed its own pattern of investigation along the same vein as the former criticism but advanced slowly at first in application of critical methods. The methods for discovery of the twofold phenomena evolved in three phases were: The literary method, which pertained to the language and style; The historical method, which dealt with the historical features; and the theological method, which was based on the characteristics of theological concepts and their development.⁹²

"These three methods are sometimes called arguments for the results to which they lead, and they may be called indiscriminately methods or arguments."⁹³ The author found it necessary to depend largely on the study of the methods made by Professor Zenos, of McCormick Theological Seminary, for an explanation of the methods of criticism. Professor Zenos wrote in the preface of 1895, "To the author's knowledge there is no single treatise in which a simple expository and non-controversial attempt is made to describe the science and art of the Higher Criticism."⁹⁴

The Literary Argument. The following explanation of this argument was based mainly on Professor Zenos' study.

This is based, ...on qualities of expression. Its fundamental principle is that an author will be consistent with himself in the use of words, idioms, phrases, and figures of speech...It is well known that every literary man develops peculiarities, sometimes more and sometimes less marked, but always real and perceptible, which betray his personality in his work...Without an effort to conceal his identity he must necessarily exhibit those traits which distinguish him from all other authors.⁹⁵

Professor Zenos singled out three specific areas of literary features:

1. With reference to the use of words the general principle is, of course, that out of the mass of vocables in any language each individual has at command only a limited number; that the vocabulary of no two individuals is precisely the same, and that each one recurs to his own vocabulary, choosing his own favorite words out of the list of their synonyms.⁹⁶

He explained further that an author has the habit of expressing his concepts with certain synonyms to the exclusion of others. Also that the usual writer develops the habit of "using words in peculiar senses

not warranted by their etymology or historical usage. The number of words that any single person is likely to divert in this manner from their proper use is ordinarily very small."⁹⁷

2. Another field where characteristics are apt to be developed is that of idioms and phrases. Every language has its stock of grammatical constructions different from normal and natural, and therefore called idiomatic...peculiar to that language. And as in the use of words of language, so also in the use of its idioms, no two persons have the same skill or follow the same mode of procedure...But in whatever way one has come to use them, or whatever his method of using them, it gives distinctiveness to the result of his writing and furnishes the critic with a basis of operations in establishing his identity.⁹⁸

3. Still another field where individual characteristics are apt to show themselves in literary work is the rhetorical quality of the style. There is real difference between the tendencies of different men in the matter of the use of rhetorical figures. One is addicted to the use of inverted order in the construction of his sentences; another to frequent parentheses; another to abrupt transitions; another to repetition of the same thought in different words in two or more consecutive sentences expressive of different thoughts... And within the sphere of these peculiarities developed by each much difference will be discerned by the careful student of style...It scarcely needs to be said that all characteristics are observed and recognized not as individual traits of style merely, but in their various and characteristic combinations.⁹⁹

This seemed to have been a standard explanation of the literary method with its attendant ramifications, as it has been developed in both secular and Biblical criticism. Carlstadt was the connecting link between criticism applied by the humanists and the criticism of the Bible, and his criticism was based on the style of writing in the Pentateuch,¹⁰⁰ as seen by the following excerpts from his writings:

Therefore the painstaking reader who weighs within himself with a true judgment the books of authors, will finally discern what value the style has, in order that he may form a conjecture...for verily I think that it is impossible to trace an author by style, unless I have previous knowledge of other volumes by the same author.¹⁰¹

However Carlstadt included more under the term style than did Du Pin or Zeno and others as seen by the following.

For the style of a treatise includes not the words alone, but the matter and the opinions--that is, the soul of the words; ...¹⁰²

As Doctor Gray commented, Carlstadt was far ahead of his time in this attempt at criticism on the basis of style. The beginning use of the literary method in Higher Criticism is usually accredited to Jean Astruc's analysis of Genesis according to Divine names. No evidence has been found to show that Astruc adopted the literary argument as it existed in his day and applied it "in toto" to the Pentateuch. His reasons propounded for his theory of documents in Genesis were four:

- 1.) Genesis contains striking repetitions of the same events, e. g., the creation, the flood, 2.) God is designated by two different names, Elohim (Dieu) which indicates that He is the supreme Being, and Jehovah (L'Eternel), the name which expresses His essence, 3.) This distinction appears only in Genesis and the first two chapters of Exodus... 4.) Certain events are related in Genesis before others although they took place later.¹⁰³

Astruc actually made his document analysis on the basis of the number (2) as given above, that is, the variation in use of Divine names, which was only a very limited, modified form of the literary principle. If he knew of the principle as set forth by Du Pin or Carlstadt he gave little evidence of it. The real intent of Astruc's

application of criticism was to defend the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in the face of Spinoza's denial. Professor Zeno said of Astruc's work, "The importance of Astruc's work consists not so much in the discovery of new facts, or in the use of new principles, as in the consistent application of these principles in constructing a theory."¹⁰⁴ From the facts at hand, this appeared to be an overstatement, for strictly speaking, Astruc did not apply all the principles of former criticism but just the one on style in a restricted sense. As Doctor Briggs, who was of his own school of criticism, criticized his efforts, "His analysis is in some respects too mechanical...He relies also too much upon the different uses of the Divine names, and too little upon variations in style, language, and narrative."¹⁰⁵ After Astruc divided Genesis into what he called A and B, the original sources which he supposed Moses used, he found that the analysis did not fit for all of Genesis. The following gave his own view at trying to resolve the difficulties before him,

As I proceeded, I perceived that yet more records must be admitted. There are certain passages in Genesis, in the description of the Deluge, for example, where the same things are repeated up to three times. Since the name of God is not employed in these passages, and there is in consequence no reason to assign them to one of the first two records, I thought that I ought to place these third repetitions under a third column C, as belonging to a third record C...

There are still other records, where similarly the name of God is not used, and which consequently do not belong to either the column A or the column B.¹⁰⁶

"Altogether, he found grounds for thinking that fragments of no less than ten minor documents were traceable in Genesis, in addition to the Elohim and Jehovah records."¹⁰⁷

Astruc's first reason for the analysis has become commonly known as the "doublet theory" and had no counterpart in the former literary criticism. His second and third reasons were a crude adaptation of Du Pin's second principle on style, for Astruc did not have a source external to the Pentateuch for a comparison of style.

Johann Eichhorn furthered the literary argument and called his work "higher criticism", insisting that all the Old Testament must undergo the test, saying,

Already, long ago scholars have sought to determine the age of anonymous Greek and Roman writings now from their contents, and then since these are often insufficient for an investigation of this kind, from their language. They have also by the same means separated from ancient works pieces of later origin, which by accidental circumstances have become mingled with the ancient pieces. And not until the writings of the Old Testament have been subjected to the same test can any one assert with confidence that the sections of a book all belong in reality to the author whose name is prefixed.¹⁰⁸

Eichhorn wrote in the preface to his second edition of Introduction to the Old Testament:

I am obliged to give the most pains to a hitherto entirely unworked field, the investigation of the internal condition of the particular writings of the Old Testament by help of the Higher Criticism (a new name to no Humanist).¹⁰⁹

With these thoughts in mind, Eichhorn divided Genesis and Exodus 1 and 2 trying to confirm and correct the labors of Astruc, but he also, "pointed out the fact that the sections of Genesis in which the names of Jehovah and Elohim were respectively used were characterized by other differences of style."¹¹⁰ Doctor George Adam Smith quoted some of these linguistic variations:

The passages which use Elohim speak of Him as "creating" the world, and talk of "the beasts of the earth"; the passages which usually employ the name Jahweh speak of him as 'making or forming' the world, and talk of 'the beasts of the field'. These are but two instances out of many: Eichhorn had struck a line of differences too numerous and too distinctive to prove fallacious.¹¹¹

Eichhorn extended the documentary division on this principle of style to the whole of the Pentateuch. The critics who followed him in development of the documental hypothesis and also the fragmentary, for the most part, used the one principle of variation in Divine names.¹¹² Throughout this whole period, up to early 19th century, the criticism was based on the assumption that variation in Divine names meant different original documents and therefore from the material around these names an analysis could be made of the style. The companion theory of "doublets or triplets" was also expanded from the original suggestion by Astruc, though nothing was found to prove they were double narratives rather than the custom of Oriental repetition.

The Historical Argument.

The fundamental principle of the form of reasoning in this method or argument is that contemporaneous history is naturally reflected and expressed in the writings emanating from any age...the unconscious appearance of the traces of the environment...It may be analyzed into several subordinate arguments as follows:

1. The facts and institutions of contemporaneous history are reflected in the literary products of any period.¹¹³

2. A second form of the historical argument may be called the argument from anachronism. An anachronism is a confusion in chronology by which events are misplaced with reference to one another.¹¹⁴

3. The third form of the historical argument is in a certain sense the counterpart of the argument from anachronism, and consists in

using silence as the ground of inference. The principle, very broadly stated, is that silence as well as expression is significant. This principle, however, in order to be made practically useful must be narrowed down very much. The question must be asked, Of what is silence significant? The answer can be one of three, silence may mean (1) ignorance of the facts in regard to which the author is silent, or (2) indifference to them, or (3) design to keep back or suppress the knowledge of them.¹¹⁵

4. The fourth form of the Historical Argument may be designated in general the Argument from Concinnity...And it may be used in one of two ways, i. e., either destructively or constructively. (1) In its simplest form this consists in drawing inferences from confusion or disorder in a literary production.¹¹⁶

.....
(2) The constructive use of the argument from concinnity consists in the discovery not of defects in the actual order, but in the discovery of possible order where there is only apparent confusion. It is virtually the establishment of a center or starting point, and the successful grouping about that center of the confused material; or the tracing out of a consistent whole, beginning at the starting point.¹¹⁷

De Wette was the first to congruently supplement the literary argument with the historical. He made use of the historical data found in the Biblical books by making internal comparisons of facts he discovered. He developed the supplemental theory on these two principles, holding that historical comparisons showed that the Elohist document had been supplemented by other historical material from other sources, probably one or more J narratives. De Wette still leaned heavily upon the literary argument and more especially the distinction of divine names.

W. Robertson Smith, a noted critic of the later part of the eighteenth century wrote of the historical method:

The historical method compares the insti-

tutions set forth in the several codes with the actual working institutions of Israel, as we see them in the historical books; 118

Smith said that the first period of Pentateuch criticism, ending with Holdeke's work of 1869 was built almost exclusively on literary line of evidence. And that when the new school of criticism arose it had the historical argument with which to test its theory of supplements, especially that the priestly laws were later than remainder of Pentateuch.¹¹⁹ He held that the historical argument sealed that which had been projected by the literary argument. But the outstanding higher critic, S. R. Driver, wrote, "I readily allow that there are some critics who combine with their literary criticism of the Old Testament an historical criticism which appears to me to be unreasonable and extreme"...¹²⁰ Driver did not sufficiently define historical criticism so one might know positively what he meant. For the most part his criticism was built on literary argument but he also made use of supposed historical anachronisms.

Both the supplementary and crystallization hypothesis were products of the application of these two arguments, as used largely by De Wette, Bleek, and Ewald. However, the greatest use and abuse of the historical argument came under the developmental hypothesis, when Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen reconstructed Israel's history. This may have been what Driver had reference to when he spoke of historical argument.

The Theological Argument. This argument was called the argument from content of thought when used with other than theological works.

It differs from the literary argument

in dealing with the content rather than the form of literary productions, and from the historical argument in taking account and using as a basis of operations, not the historical setting and its correspondence or non-correspondence with the historic content in the books, but the subject matter of the books as especially reflecting directly or indirectly the system of thought of the authors.¹²¹

It became a part of the historical argument when the thought content was compared to the outside writings. According to Professor Zenos the argument from content was based on the fact that content may,

- (1) reveal the individuality of the author; in such a case the use made of it is analogous to the use of considerations drawn from style and qualities of expression...
- (2) identify the writing with a period by its correspondence or lack of correspondence with the thought outside of the writing, and by its other inner characteristics.¹²²

Thus an author's thought content was taken to be as characteristic of his writing as his style of writing, though both were highly subjective. It was assumed that each author had a "certain circle of knowledge, his meditations or speculations, determined to a large extent by his character, education, and environment."¹²³

Taken all together, they constitute a complex which, to the skilled workman in this department, is recognizable just as the features of his face are to the physical eye and the character of his style to the literary critic. These things evince themselves in everything to which he gives expression.¹²⁴

Each author was thought to have a favorite central theological thought around which all his theological expression revolved.

In fact, this same unconscious selection of a center, and grouping one's views of religion, takes place not in the narrow department of the doctrine of God only, but through the whole field of theology in its broadest

sense.¹²⁵

The theological argument, as originally stated, did not allow for the evolving of theological concepts; but came to be connected with evolutionary views which posited this as part of the argument. The argument was based then on the consecutive development of thought, and especially in the case of the Bible, on the theological thought. It was assumed that if the same idea was expressed in several different ways the statements could be arranged from the earlier simple forms to the later more highly developed forms. Thus the argument ran,

Conversely, if they are not found in the order in which they can thus be arranged, they are in disorder and must be rearranged...If of two documents that which claims a later date gives a cruder form of a teaching, the natural inference would be, upon this principle, that the claim is not valid; that the order of the two writings has been somehow inverted, and that the true order is the reverse of the apparent.¹²⁶

The theological argument was first applied in the fourth decade of the nineteenth century simultaneously by two scholars, Wilhelm Vatke and Leopold George.¹²⁷ "Vatke contended that the legislation of the Pentateuch was too elaborate, as compared with the religious ideas of the later age, to be as much older as it is believed to be."¹²⁸ Graf was the first to combine the results of the literary--historical analysis of Hupfeld with the reconstruction of the history of Israelitish religion. The theological argument was used to fit into the scheme of Hegelian philosophy of evolutionary development; thus the underlying thought was that there was a continuous development of Israel's religious life and institutions.¹²⁹

On this ground any portion of the Pentateuch could be placed as to document and date according to its development of theological concept. The application of this argument in conjunction with the two former ones brought forth what has been commonly called the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen theory or the developmental hypothesis.

D. The Methods of Later Critics

Doctor Charles A. Briggs, who was regarded as an outstanding evangelical critic, adopted the principles of Du Pin and enlarged them to six as stated below:

- (1) The writing must be in accordance with its supposed historical position as to time and place and circumstances.
- (2) Differences of style imply differences of experience and age of the same author, or when sufficiently great, difference of author and of period of composition.
- (3) Differences of opinion and conception imply differences of author when these are sufficiently great, and also differences of period of composition.
- (4) Citations show the dependence of the author upon the author or authors cited, where these are definite and the identity of the author cited can be clearly established. In cases of doubt as to which author uses the others, or whether two or more authors may not depend upon an earlier author; this doubt can be resolved only by the careful determination of the exact interrelation of the passages and the genesis of the one out of the others. this is the most difficult principle of the higher criticism in its application.
- (5) Positive testimony as to the writing in other writings of acknowledged authority.
- (6) The silence of authorities as to the writing in question.¹³⁰

The difference between Doctor Briggs' statement of the principles

and that of Du Pin was that Briggs made citations, internal and external, separate principles as he also did the argument of silence. Hence it was an added emphasis on citations and silence. Doctor Briggs said that because the argument from silence had risen to greater importance since the 17th century he felt constrained to enlarge upon it, as below.

- (a) Silence is a lack of evidence for the reason that the matter in question did not come within the scope of the author's argument.
- (b) It is an evidence that it had certain characteristics that excluded it from the author's argument.
- (c) The matter in question lies fairly within the author's scope and was omitted for good and sufficient reasons that may be ascertained. The omission was intentional.
- (d) The silence of the author as to that which was within the scope of his argument was unconscious and implies ignorance of the matter.
- (e) When the silence extends over a variety of writings of different authors, of different classes of writings and different periods of composition, it implies either some strong and overpowering external restraint such as divine interposition; or ecclesiastical or civil power, or it implies a general and wide-spread public ignorance which presents a strong presumptive evidence in favor of non-existence of the matter in question.¹³¹

Doctor Driver, who was considered a very able critic especially in literary analysis, condensed the above six principles into two, and in his work on Genesis wrote the following account of them,

And as soon as the book is studied with sufficient attention, phenomena disclose themselves which show incontrovertibly that it is composed of distinct documents or sources, which have been welded together by a later compiler or redactor into a continuous whole. These phenomena are very numerous; but they may be reduced in the main to the two follow-

ing heads: (1) the same event is doubly recorded; (2) the language, and frequently the representation as well varies in different sections.¹³²

Strictly speaking neither of these were principles. The second was a partial adaptation of Briggs' number (2) point above, on variation in style and diction. Driver's first point in reference to "doublets" was the same assumption that Astruc and others following had made, without foundation critically and without precedent in former non-Biblical criticism. Though Driver based his criticism mainly on literary analysis and made light of historical analysis, yet the noted critic, W. Robertson Smith, held mainly to historical criticism. As he put it,

The critical study of ancient documents means nothing else than the careful sifting of their origin and meaning in the light of history. The first principle of criticism is that every book bears the stamp of the time and circumstance in which it was produced.¹³³

Smith did, however, hold that there were actually two criteria on which the documentary analysis rested, as seen by the following quote.

The strength of the present position of Pentateuch criticism is in good measure due to the fact that two lines of inquiry have converged to a common result.

These two lines of inquiry may be called respectively the historical and the literary.¹³⁴

He applied the historical method by a comparison of the institutions as established codes and the actual keeping of the laws and institutions in the historical books. Speaking of the literary method he said,

The literary method compares the several

parts of the Pentateuch with one another, taking note of diversities of style and manner, of internal contradictions or incongruities, and of all other points that forbid us to regard the whole Torah as the homogeneous composition of a single writer.¹³⁵

The outstanding critic, George Adam Smith, had this to say of the methods of such Higher Criticism:

Purely philological evidence, where it alone is available, is often ambiguous: but...difference of style and language is in most cases accompanied by differences of substance.

.....
We have seen that this (the discrimination of the documents) depends not only upon differences of vocabulary, phrases and idiom, but still more upon differences of fact and substance in narratives which relate the same events.¹³⁶

The authors of The Interpreter's Bible did not specifically state methods of ascertaining the various supposed sources of the Pentateuch. However, they assumed that the documentary hypothesis was proven and the extent of the various documents established. That they held this to be true on the same grounds as given above was seen to be true from the following:

It may be noted here that the solution of the problem of the growth of the Hexateuch involves two things: the books must be analyzed into their component sources, and the chronological relationship of the sources must be determined.¹³⁷

Doctor Cuthbert Simpson, one of the authors of The Interpreter's Bible, gave three reasons for accepting the composite character of the Hexateuch: "A. Parallel Narratives and Laws...B. Inconsistencies within Narratives and Laws...C. Chronological Difficulties."¹³⁸ The authors of The Interpreter's Bible did not actually say they fully accepted the Graf-Wellhausen theory but clearly intimated the same as

seen by the following;

The Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis has commanded the assent of the great majority of Old Testament critics for more than sixty years, and has served as the point of departure for investigation of the internal structure of the several sources.¹³⁹

The author went on to give the structure of the various documents with their purposes and editions, and in summary said,

The conclusions advanced in this article stand within the framework of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. This as it was first formulated was primarily a literary analysis, but Wellhausen himself initiated the investigation which was to show how the documents, both in their origin and in their development, were related to the history of Israel as it is known to us.¹⁴⁰

Thus the methods of the later critics have not materially differed from those of the earlier time except that much more use and credit was given to the argument of silence and historical development in evolutionary patterns.

E. Summary and Conclusions

Summary. Higher Criticism arose during the Renaissance under the humanists who investigated writings as to their integrity, authenticity, literary features, and credibility. To find the facts to answer these questions they worked out a system of principles, which De Pin gave as time, style, viewpoints expressed, external citations. There was the assumption on the part of some higher critics of the Bible that these had been verified methods of investigation and were applicable to the Scriptures. No evidence was found that these meth-

ods had been verified for use in the type of investigation which the critics applied to the Pentateuch. The known illustrations of the usage of these principles showed that it was necessary to have a well established historical background to work in and writings from which to establish an author's style of writing.

The critics of the Pentateuch did not just adopt the methods and apply them to the Scriptures but adapted them slowly over a period of time. The first method applied to the Pentateuch was along the literary lines and very much limited in scope, resting mainly on the variation in the use of Divine names. It was an attempt to separate certain portions on the usage of Divine names and from those portions establish the style used in supposed original document; then in turn that was used as a measurement for deciding what other parts of the Pentateuch belonged to that supposed document. The literary argument became the basis of all other arguments but itself fell into disrepute in later years.

The historical argument concerned the way in which a writing fitted its supposed historical setting and was applied extensively from the time of De Wette on to the formation of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. It was perverted from its original sense and used by the humanists to an evolutionary slant, making all history fit a pattern of development.

The theological argument was the last adapted for use by the critics and it was based on the idea that each writer is known by his viewpoints or opinions which can be traced. This was also perverted to fit the philosophy of evolutionary development, and used to place different passages historically according to their development

of concepts.

The later critics of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries applied these same methods but they elaborated on the importance of the arguments of silence and citations. Both of these arguments were changed in their intent from former classical criticism, in that they were applied within the work (Pentateuch) rather than in comparison with external sources. The earlier critics relied heavily on literary evidence while the later critics based their conclusions almost entirely on historical criticism. The latest combined effort at this type of criticism has been The Interpreter's Bible which has based its conclusions foundationally on the Graf-Kuenen application of the methods according to evolutionary philosophy.

Conclusions. Higher Criticism of the Bible had a precedent in the application of criticism to the classical and ecclesiastical writings by the humanists. The destructive critics of the Bible did not adopt the methods of the former criticism "in toto" at first but slowly evolved their own pattern of criticism. The humanists applied the methods where there was a known historical background and writings by which to determine an author's style. These two requirements were lacking in connection with the criticism of the Pentateuch, therefore it made their application questionable.

CHAPTER IV

AN EXAMINATION OF THE METHODS AND THEIR APPLICATION

As stated in Chapter I, it was necessary both that the methods be legitimate in determining the sources of the Pentateuch and that they be used under proper circumstances without prejudice in order to have verified results. The problem of this portion of the study was to determine whether the methods given above in Chapter III were valid in ascertaining the supposed original sources of the Pentateuch and whether they were used under proper conditions without bias.

A. The Literary Argument Examined

The Value of the Argument. The literary argument centered around the style of the writing. As given by Briggs it was: "Differences of style imply differences of experience and age of the same author, or sufficiently great differences of author and of period of composition."¹⁴¹

This principle was used in criticism of Roman, Greek, and ecclesiastical writings, as shown above in Chapter II, but the way in which it was applied was different. In the secular criticism of the ancient writings the critics placed work against work in the background of known history. Works that were known to be authentic were investigated as to style and diction, and the doubtful writing

was measured by that standard.¹⁴² This type of application was not possible in Biblical Higher Criticism because there were no writings aside from the Pentateuch by which to set up a standard of style; therefore the Pentateuch had to be at one and the same time the standard of style and the writing examined. It would have been more in accordance with the former use of the principles if the critics had taken one book of the Pentateuch as a means to establish a standard of style and then compared the others to that. However, even this would have been a neglect of the fact of the complete unity of the Pentateuch. Secondly, the secular critics applied the principles to whole works with very little distinctions made within the works. And this was done only when there were a number of works from which to determine a certain author's style. These principles may have worked in uncovering gross forgeries of entire works by a background of a number of other known works by an author and a volume of history for the period. However, that did not necessarily mean they were reliable to determine authorship, time of writing, or source of material without that standard. Thirdly, there was no record of secular Higher Criticism having used these principles to determine the sources from which an author drew and to thus divide a writing into a multitude of sections put together by a series of redactors.

According to Brigg's own statement above on style, the differences could be attributed to three variations: (1) a difference in the experience or age of the author; (2) a different period of composition; or (3) a different author. Professor Zenos listed two other reasons for variation in style: (1) "cause of difference in style is to be found in the character of the subject to be treated;"¹⁴³

(5) "cause of difference in stylistic peculiarities may be found in the use of different assistants by the author..."¹⁴⁴ It was noted that Briggs felt that difference in style only "implied" the various alternatives. No other critic made the principle any stronger in force than this, however in application it was taken as proof rather than as "implication". Further subjectivity in the principle was plain in the phrase "when sufficiently great" and an almost identical phrase was used in the principle on viewpoint. No standard has been set up to help any one critic to determine "when sufficiently great" material differences in style had been found. This seemed to be clear proof of the lack of objectiveness in the principle. Though all higher critics could agree as to the use of the principle, the results thereof, their conclusions would still be drawn from subjective evidence thus making them unreliable.

This subjectivity of the linguistic method and its unreliability was seen by the remarks of both the proponents and opponents of the results of Higher Criticism. The learned Old Testament student and Hebrew scholar, Geerhardus Vos, wrote of the linguistic argument, "how largely the subjective element enters into all such argumentation, needs no special proof."¹⁴⁵ He stated further, "that the history of the linguistic argument is not adapted to inspire confidence in its validity." As proof Vos gave the following considerations:

It was considered from the outset, even by advanced and rationalistic critics, with distrust and reserve...In the main, the argument was either met by direct refutation, or at least by the claim that the materials were not distinct and conspicuous enough to justify the inference of diversity of authorship and of sources. The latter was the prevalent opinion among such men as Hasee, Herbst,

Jahn, Sack, and even Ewald. In 1817 De Wette declared that he would not undertake to eliminate the original source from Genesis and the first chapters of Exodus by a purely literary process. The argument found no more favor with Hartmann, who pronounced it perilous and misleading. So largely did this sentiment of aversion and distrust prevail among the critics, that Gesenius, in his "History of the Hebrew Language" 1815, disregarded the claims of Eichhorn and Ilgen entirely. The fragmentary hypothesis was in no wise favorable to the literary criticism.

.....
 Since the fall of the supplementary hypothesis, and the general acceptance of the documentary hypothesis, the linguistic argument came, if not into disrepute, at least into neglect, among the critics.¹⁴⁶

R. W. Rishell, formerly of Boston University School of Theology, wrote after an extensive study of the linguistic method:

The danger that the judgment of the investigator will be warped by other considerations is great, and jeopardizes, in consequence, all his conclusions. On the whole, linguistic considerations are to be pronounced insufficient. And this is indeed tacitly acknowledged by the critics, who seek to support arguments drawn from this source by others less open to suspicion.¹⁴⁷

Professor Zeno, who was a critic in his own right, came to the same practical conclusion.

There is no department of investigation where original and independent research leads investigators to a wider variety of conclusions than the meaning of the same phenomena in a literary production. The same differences, for instance, between the first and the last half of a writing will appear to one expert to indicate a difference of authorship; to another only a difference of purpose or object in view; to a third only occasional or incidental variation; to a fourth a difference of age and surrounding in the author; and to a fifth a difference of medium or amanuensis employed in the composition of the two parts.¹⁴⁸

The highly reputed critic, George Adam Smith, said of the argument on style, "I have already said that linguistic analysis is often unable to distinguish between the Jahwist and the Elohist."¹⁴⁹ Therefore Smith based his criticism almost entirely on historic considerations.

Application of the Literary Argument. The main application of the linguistic method was that which was started by Astruc, the dividing of the Pentateuch as to original sources according to the use of Divine names. Doctor Briggs based the proof of this application on Exodus 6:2-3, where it was written: "And Elohim spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am Yahweh: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as 'El Shaddai, but by my name Yahweh I was not known to them."¹⁵⁰ Briggs reasoned that as Yahweh was used in Genesis, that "Here is a glaring inconsistency not invented by critics, but on the surface of Genesis itself."¹⁵¹ He held that Astruc's discovery that the "inconsistency" was due to different original sources thus settled the supposed difficulty. He further explained this application in the Pentateuch, thus,

Criticism has found that the priestly writer who wrote Ex. vi. never uses the divine name Yahweh in his document prior to Ex. vi., when he states that it was revealed to Moses for the first time. The use of the divine name Yahweh in Genesis is in the Judaic document, which nowhere mentions or seems to know anything about the revelation of the name of Yahweh to Moses. He uses it as the name of God from the beginning.¹⁵²

Briggs recognized that there was the difficulty that Elohim appeared in what was supposed to be separated as the J document but removed the difficulty by affirming Ilgen and Hupfeld's position that another

document, which used Elohim, had been redacted with the J document. And the use of Yahweh in Exodus III was attributed to the E document as a parallel narrative to J of chapter IV. He seemed boastful in saying, "Thus the whole difficulty of the use of the divine names is solved."¹⁵³

Doctor Simpson, in The Interpreter's Bible, held to this same interpretation of Exodus 6:2, 3 and called it "the key to the composition of the Hexateuch."¹⁵⁴ He made this further connection in order to have a few passages from which to establish a style of writing:

Gen. 17:1 and 35:11, recording God's revelation of himself as El Shaddai to Abraham and Jacob respectively...obviously belong to the same source as Exod. 6:2, 3; and those stories in Genesis in which the name Yahweh is known to the actors must come from another source.¹⁵⁵

Realizing the critics relied heavily upon the usage of divine names to determine the sources, the facts below were noted by Doctor Young:

The divine names are not adequately distributed in Genesis to form a basis for analysis into documents....a. The name Jehovah (Yehovah) does not appear in the following chapters, Genesis 1, 23, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, nor in Exodus 1, 2. In the last eleven chapters of Genesis it occurs but once, i. e., Gen. 49:18. In the last twenty chapters it appears 15 times, three of these appearances being in chap. 38, and 8 in chap. 39. Despite this fact, portions of J are thought to be found in each of these twenty chapters.

b. The name of Elohim is not found in Genesis 10-16, 18, 29, 34, 36, 37, 47, 49.

c. The Deity is not mentioned as such in Genesis 23, 34, 36, 37, 47. Nevertheless, according to Carpenter and Harford, these chapters are distributed as follows:¹⁵⁶

Doctor Young showed by a chart how these chapters were minutely di-

vided by the critics between J, P, and E. Therefore, it was plain that the criterion of Divine names did not fit large portions of the main book of the Pentateuch where the criticism had to find a form of style.

The eminent conservative Old Testament scholar, Doctor William Henry Green, brought out, by the examination of seventeen passages, that Elohim is repeatedly found along with Jehovah in sections attributed to J....Jehovah occurs repeatedly in sections attributed to P and E, where, by the hypothesis, only Elohim should be found."¹⁵⁷ This was what forced Doctor Harper, a noted higher critic, in his Hebraica, to say of Exodus 1:1 to 7:7, "the language is but poor guide, owing probably to R's interference; not even the names of the Deity are to be relied on implicitly, being freely intermingled."¹⁵⁸ Thus Harper disagreed emphatically with Doctor Simpson's use of Exodus 6:2, 3 as a key passage to determine the style. Harper also felt keenly "the unsatisfactory use of the names of the Deity" in deciphering the documents in Numbers 20-22. Regarding the passage he said, "Yahweh is the prevailing name, Elohim occurring but nine times in the entire section; this is, however, more easily explained on the R hypothesis than by any other."¹⁵⁹ Was not this reliance upon redactors to explain the use of Divine names where they did not fit their theory, actually a deathblow to the whole idea? For the criteria of division were the Divine names, yet in many places, the name did not fit the supposed division, it had to be assumed that an unknown redactor changed the original source. As Doctor Green stated it, "The hypothesis is self-destructive; for it can only be defended by arguments which undermine its foundations."¹⁶⁰

The writer felt keenly aware that the critics misinterpreted their "hey" passage, Exodus 6:2, 3. The American Standard translation with the footnotes made the crucial phrase much clearer: "but by (as to) my name 'Jehovah' I was not known (made known) to them." This fitted perfectly with the context following. God was about to bring to pass a show of his power to prove to Israel and Egypt that he was in personal covenant relationship with his people and was their deliverer. The passage does not mean that the name Jehovah was not known previously but that Elohim wanted to make himself known to them as to the meaning of the name Jehovah. The deep meaning of the name as the covenant relationship had not been known before to the nation. In the Hebrew language a name was not merely an appellation but signified character and relationship, and in this instance God was to do great miracles and bring himself into close association with Israel to teach the nation once for all the deep significance of being their Jehovah. The writer of Exodus showed by the context that the passage meant he was about to make known the relationship of God (Elohim) to his people as Jehovah. Thus in 6:7 and 10:2 respectively it was shown:

and I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God (Elohim); and ye shall know that I am Jehovah your God (Elohim), who bringeth you out from under the burden of the Egyptians.

and that thou mayest tell in the ears of thy son, and of thy son's son, what things I have wrought upon Egypt, and my signs which I have done among them; that ye may know that I am Jehovah.

Jehovah's covenant relationship was to be proved to Israel, as seen in 6:7; 10:2; 16:12; 24:46; and to Pharaoh in 7:17; 8:6, 18; 9:14, 29;

and to Egypt in 7:5; 14:4, 18. That this was the meaning of the term was seen by many references in the Old Testament: I Kings 8:43; Psalms 9:11; 91:14; Isaiah 52:6; 64:1, 2; Jeremiah 14:21; Ezekiel 39:6, 7, especially Isaiah 64:1, 2 showed this:

Oh that thou wouldst rend the heavens, that thou wouldst come down, that the mountains might quake at thy presence, as when fire kindleth the brushwood, and the fire causeth the waters to boil: to make thy name known to thine adversaries.

Supposing the critical hypothesis to be true does not in reality solve the problem, for the unknown editors or redactors did not feel there was a contradiction between Jehovah being used throughout Genesis and the statement in Exodus 6:2, 3, else they would have changed it as they made other interpolations and changes according to the critics. Both names for Deity, Elohim and Jehovah, are found in every main document the critics have claimed to separate.

The Relationship Between Usage of Divine Names and Style. Assuming that the variation in usage of divine names showed different original documents the critics moved then to establish the style of writing used by the unknown writer. This was done in three different ways.

First, Eichhorn accepted the divisions as made by Astruc and noted that there was a difference in style connected with the various divisions. Briggs stated that this work of Eichhorn stood even to his day, however, it was difficult to see how he reached that conclusion when the critics themselves brought forth that there was another basic E document besides a number of lesser documents and redactions discovered after Eichhorn's time.

Secondly, a standard method of establishing the style was that adapted by Driver. As given above, Driver used only the principle of variation in style, diction, and representation: and coupled with it the "doublet" theory. Driver assumed that Genesis 1:1-2:4a and 2:4b-25 was a double narrative. He held this from the fact that he thought the order of creation in the second part was man, vegetation, animals; while in the first section it was vegetable, animal and man. He said that the two sections differed also in form.

The style of 1:1-2:4a is unornate, measured, precise, and particular phrases frequently recur...(God) simply speaking or creating¹⁶¹

.....
If the parts assigned to P be read attentively, even in a translation and compared with the rest of the narrative, the peculiarities of its style will be apparent. Its language is that of a jurist, rather than a historian; it is circumstantial, formal, and precise; a subject is developed systematically; and completeness of detail, even at the cost of some repetition, is regularly observed...¹⁶²

The doublet theory has been discussed in the latter portion of the chapter, however, brief comment was necessary here. A logical study of this portion of Scripture without the higher criticism "bias", revealed that it was not a reversal of order but that the supposed second divergent account was really a fuller explanation of some of the facts given in the first chapter of Genesis with a shift of emphasis. In the first chapter of Genesis Moses was dealing with the overall picture of creation order and it was cosmological in center. While in Genesis chapter two Moses was giving the creation as it centered around man, the highest creation, or it was anthropological in center. Thus the author had a different subject matter and purpose

in the second section than in the first, giving ample reason for difference in style and diction. Briggs and Driver both made lists of characteristics of the different documents; however, as stated above, all that can be drawn from the "implications of style" are "implications", not facts. When there was a standard of style from a known source then style differences gave "implications"; but in the case of the Pentateuch there was no standard. This was reasoning in a circle; for how could it be known what the style of P was, except by examining the passages assigned to P? But how were the passages assigned to P? By the variation in style, without a known standard. Some have said that it was established from the "clear" usage of two divine names in Genesis 1:1-2:4a (Elohim) and 2:4b-25 (Jehovah), the former P and the later J by some and JE by others. The critics have admitted that for the rest of Genesis and the Pentateuch the divine names were not safe criteria. Remembering that previously secular higher critics determined the style of an author on a total work or series of works, as has secular criticism since that day, the difference in this procedure was plain. Driver would have had to determine the style, diction, and representation of an author on 35 verses, approximately 350 original Hebrew words--approximately 600 English words when translated. This passage was on one subject, one event, and for one purpose. This was not a correct application of the literary principle as stated above, therefore it was not a valid, reliable way to set a standard by which to test the rest of the Hexateuch.

Having given the supposed characteristics of the so called P document, Driver said that, "in Genesis, as regards the limits of P there is practically no difference of opinion amongst critics."¹⁶³

But Max Loehr and Volz, both recognized critics, attacked not only the limits of P but its very existence and unity.¹⁶⁴ Driver proceeded to give the extent of the P document in Genesis as though it had been verified evidence on the above principle. As to the remainder of Genesis Driver said:

The parts of Genesis which remain after the separation of P have next to be considered. These also, as it seems are not homogeneous in structure. Especially from c. 20 onwards the narrative exhibits marks of composition; and the component parts, though not differing from one another in diction and style so widely as either differs from P, and being so welded together that the lines of demarcation between them frequently cannot be fixed with certainty appear nevertheless to be plainly discernible.¹⁶⁵

After acknowledging that the use of divine names was not a safe criterion in these sections, he said, "other phraseological criteria are slight, there are however differences of representation."¹⁶⁶ The only thing he sighted in the way of a difference of representation was, "Notice also that the genealogies in J (both here and elsewhere) are cast in a different mould from those of P, and are connected together by similarities of expression, which do not occur in P."¹⁶⁷ This was very subjective data, that could give nothing more than implications.

Thirdly, a method used for making transition from variation of names to general style of documents was that of Doctor Simpson in The Interpreter's Bible. He felt that, as Genesis 17:1 and 35:11 gave the account of God's revelation as El Shaddai to Abraham and Jacob respectively, they "obviously belong to the same source as Exod. 6:2-3; and those stories in Genesis in which the name Yahweh is known to the actors must come from another source..."¹⁶⁸ His reasoning at this

point was far from clear because both "Jehovah" and "El Shaddai" were used in Genesis 17:1.

And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, Jehovah appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am God Almighty (El Shaddai); walk before me and be thou perfect.

The following was Doctor Simpson's further argument on this point.

Gen. 17:1; 35:11; and Exodus 6:2, 3 thus provide a point of departure. Gen. 17:1, with which the rest of that chapter is continuous, states explicitly that Abraham was at the time ninety-nine years old. Now we have already seen how the recorded ages of the patriarchs give rise to serious chronological difficulties in the narrative of Genesis, a fact which suggests that the passages in which their ages are given come from another hand than the stories thus rendered incredible. This points to the conclusion that the age verses, and the material inseparable from them, are from the same source as Gen. 17. This material is sufficiently extensive to make it possible to discern something of the style of its author, to note many of his characteristic expressions, and to detect certain of his preconceptions, theological and other. Working with these criteria we are able to isolate from Genesis a body of material informed by a peculiar theory of revelation.¹⁶⁹

It was specifically noted that Simpson assumed chapter 17 to be continuous, and that some material was inseparable which was a great assumption in the light of the hypothesis he was trying to substantiate. Should not this material have been critically subjected to the principles before assumed continuous and inseparable? The fact that the critics found the ages of the patriarchs difficult to understand did not prove there were additions by another hand. Doctor Simpson said, it "suggests". But that which was a suggestion to those seeking to support a hypothesis was far from the solid foundation required by the literary argument as set forth above. Thus Doctor Simpson, and

it appeared that he was writing in accordance with the several authors of The Interpreter's Bible, made certain assumptions in order to have some thirty verses to use in establishing the style of the supposed author. The presence of Jehovah in Genesis 17:1 rendered the very basis of the argument nil. To have said Jehovah was a redactor's note in this case, at least, would have been tampering with the evidence.

The Style of the Supposed Documents. When the critics had concluded in the above three ways, that certain passages of the Pentateuch belonged to basic original documents they then proceeded to analyze these portions as to style peculiarities including diction and representations. Driver, who probably depended on the literary argument more fully than any other critic, listed the characteristic phrases for the documents: 41 for D; 50 for P; 20 for E.¹⁷⁰ Driver believed that J and E could not be separated on purely literary lines;¹⁷¹ but Holzinger set forth 125 characteristic phrases of J and 103 of E.¹⁷² Doctor Briggs made a study of thirty different words as to their usage in the documents, of these 2 were used only in E; 2 only in J; 2 only in E; 3 only in E and D; 7 only in J and E; the others were in three or more of the documents, though sometimes with slight difference in meaning. Thus according to his listing no document had more than 2 distinctive phrases or words, used in no other document. Briggs found that some words were used over one hundred times in one document and only a few times in another, yet he held this to be distinctive in usage and indicative of different authorship. But in such a case where a word is used much by one alleged document and only a few times in another, before these

could be taken for evidence it would be necessary to examine the context as to subject matter to see if the usage did not follow necessarily one type of material. But still Briggs said that "Each of the four writers has his favorite words and phrases."¹⁷³ The analysis of his word study did not show this to be true. Doctor Briggs' four main points on vocabulary were:

- (1) The great majority of words and phrases are the common stock of the language used by all.
- (2) The same theme leads to the use of similar words and phrases.
- (3) Differences begin in the percentage of use of certain words and phrases. That which is occasional with one writer is common with another, and the reverse.
- (4) There are a few words and expressions which are peculiar to certain authors used by one author and avoided by other authors.¹⁷⁴

Doctor Briggs attempted to point out distinct layers in the Hexateuch by the ascending scale in the use of words and phrases, that is, words and phrases developed in the complexity of concept from the older sources to the later ones. He gave three examples of this ascendance in the use of words: The personal pronoun; To be put to death; And, penalty of stoning. But he himself pointed out exceptions in all three cases, that is, words supposed to be early were used in later documents and visa versa; however, he attributed each exception to redactional errors.¹⁷⁵ Any exception was actually a proof that the rule was not safe to follow. Furthermore, Briggs made little or no comparison of the variation of word usage as in accordance with variation in subject matter, purpose or time of writing.

The following was Briggs' description of the style of the documents:

It is agreed among critics that E is brief,

terse, and archaic in his style. J is poetic and descriptive--as Wellhausen says, 'the best narrator in the Bible'. His imagination and fancy are ever active. P is annalistic and diffuse--fond of names and dates. He aims at precision and completeness. The logical faculty prevails. There is little color. D is rhetorical and hortatory, practical and earnest. His aim is instruction and guidance.¹⁷⁶

This was a very subjective description of style and one that could easily have been due to the fact that the manner of classifying caused passages of like subject matter to be mostly in one document. For the characteristics of vocabulary and style were used to divide the Pentateuch into documents and then they were in turn more minutely deduced from the alleged documents. This was not a correct use of the literary method as described above, for there was no standard. It was rather a circular argument as attested by both Doctor Green and Doctor Orr.¹⁷⁷ As Doctor Green put it, "The line of partition depends upon the criteria, and the criteria depend upon the line of partition, and both of these are unknown quantities."¹⁷⁸ An example of this circular was Briggs' date of the law according to its use in the Psalms, "Law in the Psalter is for the most part used in Psalms of very late postexilic date."¹⁷⁹ But these very Psalms had been shown to be post-exilic because of the reference to the law and what the critics considered historical anachronisms.

Doctor Orr examined eight alleged characteristic words and phrases of the different documents and found them to be inconsistent in use, that is, those supposed to be especially characteristic of a document were found in at least one other a few times. Below is one of the examples he gave:

We are told again that 'the Jahvist

speaks of "Sinai"; the Elohist of "Horeb". E's usage reduces itself to three passages (Ex. iii.1; xvii.6; xxxiii.6)--the last two determined mainly by the presence of the word; J employs Sinai solely in chaps. xix. (cf. ver. 1; xxiv.16, P) and xxxiv.2, 4, in connection with the actual giving of the law. The related expression "mountain of God" seems common (Ex. iii.1, E; iv.27, J; xxiv. 13?).¹⁸⁰

Another characteristic that the critics leaned heavily upon was that in J the name of Jacob was changed to Israel in the latter part of his life but that E retained Jacob throughout. But Doctor Orr showed that this was not a consistent usage, by sighting the following evidence:

J had recorded the change of name from Jacob to Israel in chap. xxxii. 24-32, but from some eccentric motive he is supposed not to commence his use of "Israel" till xxxv.21. Yet, as the text stands, "Jacob" is found in a J narrative later (chap. xxxvii 34), and "Israel" in a long series of E passages (Gen. xxxvii, 3; xlv.27, 28; xlv.1, 2; xlviii. 2, 8, 10, 11, 14, 21). There is no reason for denying these verses to E except that this name is found in them.¹⁸¹

Though not having time or space to examine each individual alleged characteristic in vocabulary, diction, and representation, yet the foregoing made clear that the analyses made on linguistic grounds by these critics did not follow a set standard but were highly subjective and slight differences were made to fit the hypothesis rather than that the hypothesis should result from comparison to a standard.

B. The Historical Argument Examined

The Value of the Argument. This argument as used applied to

four phases: The time shown by the writing; Citations, internal and external; Anachronisms; Silence. Briggs stated the aspects of the argument thus:

- (1) The writing must be in accordance with its supposed historical position as to time and place and circumstances.
- (4) Citations show the dependance of the author upon the author or authors cited.
- (5) Positive testimony as to the writing in other writings of acknowledged authority is the strongest evidence.
- (6) The argument from silence is often of great value.¹⁸²

Time. Professor Zeno brought out that "the time a writing pictured," in order to be useful evidence, depended on two conditions:

First, sufficient knowledge of the contemporaneous history and condition of things apart from the literary productions investigated, and second, clear and marked traces of that history in the writings...But these conditions...are not always present. And their absence renders the use of this method of criticism a delicate one, needing care in its use.¹⁸³

However, when dealing with the Pentateuch it was necessary to remember that it was from a historical world of its own, therefore was its own historical commentary. For this reason Professor Zeno said, "The critical problem furnished by such books is difficult, because it is impossible to avoid reasoning in a circle."¹⁸⁴ The critic's only recourse was to reconstruct the history out of the same literary production whose date and authenticity he was investigating and then compare the facts regarding the document with the facts in the documents. As Professor Zeno said, "This is certainly not a pure application of the historical argument."¹⁸⁵

Citations. In the sense that citations were used in secular

criticism none existed for the Pentateuch, for there are no extant productions of that time to give citations. The only citations then were those between and within the books of the Pentateuch. The dependence of one section of the Pentateuch upon another could not be taken to be proof of diversity of authorship any more than of Mosaic authorship. Doctor Briggs recognized the difficulty of ascertaining dependence, saying,

In case of doubt as to which author uses the other, or whether two or more authors may not depend upon an earlier author this doubt can be resolved only by the careful determination of the exact interrelation of the passages and the genesis of the one out of the other. This is the most difficult principle of the higher criticism in its application.¹⁸⁶

Even after emphasizing the need of care in application it did not seem that he exercised the needed caution in the following application.

In Josh. x.12,13, a strophe is cited from the book of Jasher, describing the theophany at the battle of Bethhoron...Two other extracts from this book are given in the O.T. The one, 2 Sam, a dirge of wonderful beauty and power; the other is a little piece of four lines in 1 Kings viii, 12,13, which, according to the LXX was also taken from the book of Jasher. This passage is cited in the words of Solomon at the dedication of the temple. If now the book of Jasher contains, besides the ode of the battle of Beth-Horon of the time of Joshua, a dirge of David, and a piece of poetry of Solomon, that book could not be earlier than the dedication of the temple of Solomon. The compiler who cites from that book could not have compiled the book of Joshua before the book from which he cites was written. Therefore, the book of Joshua could not have been compiled in its present form before the dedication of the temple. If now the book of Joshua is inseparable from the Pentateuch and makes with it a Hexateuch, and if the four documents from the Pentateuch run right on

through the book of Joshua, then it is evident that the Pentateuch could not have been compiled by Moses, but must have been compiled subsequent to the dedication of the temple of Solomon.¹⁸⁷

This was an inaccurate use of the principle of citation, because:

(1) Briggs made the book of Jasher quote Solomon when the reverse was the more plausible fact of the citation, it would seem only natural that Solomon quoted a verse from an ancient book of poetry on such a solemn occasion; (2) Too much credence was given to an obscure phrase in the LXX which was not in the Massoretic text; (3) The book of Jasher could have been a collection of songs and poetry added to as they were written much in the way of the book of Psalms. Doctor Briggs sighted the reference to the book of the "Wars of Jehovah" in Numbers 21:14 as an implication of another author than Moses.¹⁸⁸ But nothing was said in Scripture concerning the author of this book and no reason to believe that it was not a composition of the time of Moses from which he would have quoted the short piece of poetry. The reference proves nothing more than that there was such a book. These were the only important uses of this principle of citation, the others being supposed citations the critics found between the pre-conceived documents. This latter use in no manner came under the principle as adopted from earlier criticism.

Anachronisms. Doctor Briggs attempted to build a strong case against Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch by the historical argument. He held with other critics that wherever Moses was cited as having given some laws or other material that did not give proof of Mosaic authorship of the whole but only those specific portions.

Briggs stated:

All that the Pentateuch says as to Mosaic authorship we may accept as valid and true; but we cannot be asked to accept such a comprehensive inference as that Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch from the simple statements of the Pentateuch that he wrote out the few things distinctly specified.¹⁸⁹

They thought that it required them to "spring over" too wide a stretch of reasoning to accept, from the Mosaic references, his authorship; yet did not deem it such a wide jump in setting forth the documentary hypothesis on no mention of a redactor, or editing, or later date of the Pentateuch. It should be noted that the use of the third person in the Pentateuch was a common usage in Hebrew writing as shown by its use throughout the Prophets.

Briggs listed eleven "Historical objections" to Mosaic authorship and commented on them. It was worthy of note that in the comment on these Briggs was forced, with but one exception to say that this "implies"¹⁹⁰ a later time. Implications never become facts. The one exception to this was Genesis 14:14 handled below, along with Exodus 16:35. Briggs cited these "Historical Objections" saying,

These are all historical statements which are inconsistent with Mosaic authorship. Either then they are notes of later editors, or else the writings which contain them must be later than history implied in them... We are compelled either to take them as editorial notes, or, as this is difficult if not impossible in many of these cases, to regard them as from documents written by other persons than Moses.¹⁹¹

However it was found that both of these Scriptures which were claimed to be anachronisms and the others cited have explanations consistent with the historical time of Moses. Genesis 14:14 "And pursued as far as Dan." was shown in relation to Judges 18:29 to point out the difficulty: "And they called the name of the city Dan, after the name

of Dan their father, who was born unto Israel; howbeit the name of the city was Laish at the first." The context in Judges showed that the former city of Laish had been destroyed by the Danites who rebuilt a city and called it Dan. Thus a city formerly called Laish was changed to Dan; but there was no proof that it was the same city as that named in Genesis 14:14, this was an assumption on the part of the critics. The Old Testament conservative scholar, MacDill, came to the conclusion: "These critical objectors further assume that Dan, as mentioned in Genesis, was a city, though it was not so called, and though Josephus expressly says that it here designates one of the forks of the Jordan, Jor being the name of the other."¹⁹² It was also possible that the Dan mentioned in Genesis, if it was a city, was a different city than that one which had a change of name in the time of Judges. It has not been proven to be a historical objection and was only so accounted by those seeking to prove a theory.

Another clarification on an alleged anachronism was Exodus 16:35, "And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat the manna, until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan." Doctor Briggs commented, "This passage implies the entrance into Canaan after the death of Moses and the author's knowledge of the event described in Joshua 5:12."¹⁹³ The "implication" was overdrawn, for the verse did not record that which could be said only from the standpoint of Canaan. Surely a man under God's guidance and leadership, giving prophetic utterances from time to time, could have recorded this fact. It was essentially a record of a backward look to what Jehovah had

done. There was no reason for believing Moses could not have written that Israel ate manna "until" they reached the borders of Canaan. The other alleged historical objections have been dealt with by conservative scholars and they have shown that there are other alternatives of explanation which corresponded with Moses time and made the documentary hypothesis unnecessary.¹⁹⁴

Silence. Doctor Briggs felt that the argument from silence had come into great prominence and gave much weight to the documentary hypothesis. Doctor Briggs' statement in speaking of the use of the argument was noteworthy, "The internal evidence must be used with great caution and sound judgment."¹⁹⁵ The reason for extreme caution was that silence could have three meanings according to Professor Zenos.

- (1) ignorance of the facts in regard to which the author is silent
- (2) indifference to them, or
- (3) design to keep back or suppress the knowledge of them.¹⁹⁶

Of these three only the first pertained to the criticism of the Pentateuch, as the critics applied the principle. This ignorance may be due to two things: First, the non-occurrence of the event; Secondly, just that the author did not have the opportunity to know of the event due to circumstances or carelessness. Therefore the argument was very much limited to use as attested by the critic Bacon,

Arguments e silentio are only of force when a strong independent probability can be established that the writers would have used it (the material of which they are silent), or would at least have expressed themselves otherwise than they did, if they had known of it.¹⁹⁷

Professor Zenos conceded that this was a fair statement to govern the

application of the argument and that this "probability" had to be established by good evidence. He gave three conditions for establishing this possibility: 1. Importance of the matters concerned; 2. Pertinency or relevancy to the subject; 3. Absence of sufficient proof that writer intentionally ignored matters.¹⁹⁸ So the argument from silence could give only "implications" or "probabilities", not specific facts. Zeno examined the critical application of this argument in regard to the Mosaic laws and the periods of Samuel and Kings.¹⁹⁹ He came to the conclusion that it gave very weak inference because,

It does not necessarily follow that the legislation must have been observed, if known... Thus, this application of the argument, though not illicit, nor useless altogether, is apt to prove of little value practically, on account of the intricacy of the process it requires and the temptation to introduce a weak link into the chain it involves--a temptation which, even with the utmost care, it would be hard not to fall into unawares.²⁰⁰

The main use of the argument of silence was to attempt to prove that the Deuteronomic code was not in existence till the time of Josiah and the Priest's code till the exile. After a lengthy discourse on the silence as to feasts and the day of atonement, Briggs gave the following conclusion:

There are evidences of the presence from time to time in the history and literature of certain laws of D before Josiah, and of certain laws of P before Ezra, but not of these codes and writings as such. In general there is silence as to these codes and there is unconscious infraction of them. The history knows nothing of the code of D before Josiah and of the code of P before Ezra.²⁰¹

He admitted that some of the laws were known and that the silence was

not complete, thereby he disproved the foundation of his own argument. The silence was not complete so the evidence of the fact that the code was not mentioned as such bears no weight. According to the conditions given the critics should have looked for the reason for the "partial silence" rather than conclude it was due to the non-existence of the codes. W. Robertson Smith came to the conclusion by a different argument, essentially, that common worship of Jehovah, mixed with worship of the gods of Canaan, grew up among the Jewish nation because there was no written law in the form of the Deuteronomic and Priestly codes. His statements were:

Now it is certain that the first sustained and thorough attempt to put down the popular worship, and establish an order of religion conformed to the written law, was under King Josiah.

.....

These facts do not mean, merely, that the law was disobeyed. They imply that the complete system of the Pentateuch was not known in the period of the Kings of Judah, even as the theoretical constitution of Israel.²⁰²

Doctor Smith's whole argument was based on the lack of the masses to observe the law, though there was evidence that the law was at least partially known. For according to his own word,

Although many individual points of ritual resembled the ordinances of the Law, the Levitical tradition as a whole had little force in the central sanctuary as with the mass of the people.²⁰³

Therefore this was an incorrect use of the argument of silence, for the law was shown by some references to be partially known. The non-observance could have been due to indifference. Doctor Smith also highly exaggerated the mixture of the Canaanitish gods with Jehovah

worship. None of the critics' arguments examined showed a consistent use of the principle of silence according to the secular use of that principle. The main default being, they did not consider the alternatives to non-occurrence of any matter. None inquired as to the reason of the silence from the author's point of view, which was actually the heart of the argument as stated by secular critics. As Doctor Orr said in connection with critics' application of silence regarding the laws, "The argument from mere silence then, to begin with that, is proverbially precarious; in a case like the present it is peculiarly so."²⁰⁴ For instance, Doctor Kuenen wrote, "The decrees of the priestly law were not made and invented during or after the exile, but drawn up. Prior to the exile, the priests had already delivered verbally what...they afterward committed to writing."²⁰⁵ This was admission that there were evidences of the existence of portions of the code before the exile; then there was not silence. There being some practice of the laws of the code what proof was there that it was not written long before the exile?

MacDill made manifest the misconceptions possible by such an application of the argument of silence to the Pentateuch:

The Pentateuch does not mention, quote, or allude to, nor in any way indicate, suggest, or recognize any other book of the Bible. The Pentateuch, therefore, must have preceded all the other books of the Bible. It is silent in regard to Hosea, Jeremiah, and Isaiah, and it must, therefore, have been written before their time. It makes no allusion to any of the Psalms and therefore it preceded even the Davidic Psalms. Neither does the Pentateuch in any way allude to or recognize the books of Samuel, Judges, or Joshua. It is, therefore, of earlier date than any of these books. This reasoning would be entirely conclusive, provided silence of one book concern-

ing another were proof of prior existence, which it is not; for many an author has no occasion to mention contemporary or preceding authors.206

In the same manner the argument from silence applies to the documents and redactors that the critics surmise existed. No reference was made in the prophets or Pentateuch concerning former documents in the form of histories or otherwise of the extent the critics held existed. Neither has any mention ever been found of the unknown redactors nor much less of such a school of editors, therefore, according to their use of argument, neither of these existed. The critics have argued that if the Pentateuch existed the prophets would have quoted from and alluded to it; but would not the same have held true of the documents they claimed existed? Certainly the argument from silence was a precarious one to use and not a conclusive one for showing the lateness of the Pentateuchal codes, as coming from the time of the exile, having been preceded by the prophets.

Doctor Simpson applied the argument differently in The Interpreter's Bible. As alluded to above he assumed certain portions of scripture to belong together in order to have a basis for analyzing the style of the writer and characteristic expressions. He then noted that in this material there was silence as to sacrifices by the patriarchs as contrasted with the other portions of Genesis. Therefore, he reasoned that it was related to the mass of detailed regulations concerning sacrifices in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers and thus constituted the P document. The silence of these portions of scripture as to sacrifice was not unusual because of the criterion by which they were separated. They were for the most part only two

or three verses here and there separated because they were "age verses, and the material inseparable from them." Verses and passages isolated on the basis of one subject matter would naturally not cover the whole range of Pentateuchal subjects, and especially unrelated subjects.

C. The Theological Argument Examined

The theological argument was centered mainly about the viewpoints expressed in the different alleged documents. There was an attempt to show that there was an ascending scale of theological thought from the older documents to the later writings, thus an evolution of the idea of God.

There has been a portion of Biblical theology that arranged the characteristic differences of theological concept in the Bible to show the different periods, or schools of thought, and even of individuals. This same idea was applied by critics to arrange the viewpoints expressed in the alleged document to show development; but Zenos pointed out the difference in application thus:

But in applying the argument a difference is to be noticed between Biblical theology and criticism. It is one thing to recognize characteristic differences in works whose authors are already in other ways known to be different, and another to establish authorship or any other point in criticism from assumed differences or peculiarities.²⁰⁷

Because of the uncertainty of the argument it was necessary that it be used as only corroborative to other evidence; for as Professor Zenos pointed out, "In other cases it is limited in force and leads

to uncertain results.²⁰⁸ This use of the argument was definitely affected by Hegelian philosophy, which failed to take into account all the facts of history.²⁰⁹ Some men were far ahead of their time and their viewpoints did not fit into any regular plan of development. Far advanced ideas have been the product of great minds which have had only partial success in their own generation and seemed to lie dormant for generations afterward until conditions were right for their ideas to flourish. Moses was one who was greatly in advance of his years in his spiritual perceptions and God especially chose to give truth through him that was for years of progress.

Rishell brought this fact into clear focus by saying,

The evolutionist supposes that the development of religious knowledge and practice kept pace with each other. Our Old Testament leaves the impression that, far in advance and almost once for all, God laid down a standard of faith and practice, behind which the actual practice of the people lagged for centuries.²¹⁰

Thus the criteria of the principle were not only extremely subjective in character but also difficult to classify as to development because human beings did not always fit into well defined channels of progress. Much of the Old Testament was history of man's retrogression and revival in a consecutive pattern.

Doctor Briggs' ten particular theological criteria which he felt were a guide to determining the dates of the documents of the Hexateuch were:

- (1) Divine revelation in dreams is frequent in E...It is mentioned in D...but is not known to J...
- (2) There is a different conception of theophanies in these writers. E narrates frequent appearances of the theophanic angel of God. J reports appearances of theophanic angel of

Yahweh... But neither D nor P knows of such a theophanic angel...

(3) There is a different conception of miracles. The miracles of E were always wrought by means of some external instruments... The miracles of P were wrought by the finger of God...

(4) There is a difference in the doctrine of the Covenant.

(5) ...In ancient times the prophets were called "seers" from the ecstatic state in which they prophesied. The term "man of God" then came into use in the time of Elijah, and is commonly used in the Ephraimitic sources of Kings. At a later date "Nabi" was used to indicate prophets of a higher order who were preachers or spokesmen of Yahweh. The fact that E J D use this term would indicate that these documents were not composed before the age of Elijah.

(6) The doctrine of the divine Spirit is not found in E... The divine Spirit in J rests upon Moses and the elders endowing them with the power to prophesy in the ecstatic state... But P gives a doctrine of the divine Spirit which is vastly higher... Such an exalted doctrine of the divine Spirit is found elsewhere in the literature no earlier than the second Isaiah. The poem which contains it must be of late date.

(7) The attributes of God are only indirectly taught in E, but in J they appear in several important passages...

(8) There are striking differences in the doctrine of sin. Sin is mentioned in E only in general terms and in connection with special acts of evil-doing. J unfolds the doctrine of sin in a graphic manner from the point of view of personal relation to God...

(9) The divine judgment of sin is commonly expressed in the Hexateuch by hardening the heart. But the documents have different expressions for it.

(10) The doctrine of redemption in E is simply redemption from evil and not from sin... In J it is the nature of God to forgive sin... In D Yahweh chooses Israel and enters into a relation of love with them. P conceives of redemption either as the removal of sin from the persons of the sinners or sacred places, or as the covering it over at the divine altars by the blood of the sin offerings.²¹¹

Briggs' conclusion after the discussion of these points was: "These show the same order of development that we have found in the legislation and in the language, and indicate that the documents were composed at such epochs as best explain this development."²¹² It was not the object to attempt a refutation of each point but to examine the whole to ascertain if it were a correct usage of the argument as set forth in chapter III. The main objection to Briggs' use was that some of the very criteria here used to show the ascendancy of theological viewpoint he used previously to separate the documents, therefore it was a circular argument. Two notable examples of this were the statement in reference to the miracles (3) and that of the words used for the hardening of the heart. In the case of miracles, E was separated from J in Exodus 7-18 especially, principally on the basis of the instrument used in performing the miracles and the word used for the hardening of the heart. The arguments of Briggs when examined closely show that they were based almost entirely on the words used or vocabulary, which was vitally connected with the subject discussed; therefore it was essentially an argument from language rather than theological concept. As shown above certain vocabulary was directly tied to subject matter and because the documents were separated primarily on the basis of vocabulary it followed that each document dealt particularly with one category of subject matter, thus the priestly document centered around priestly language and subject.

The critics of the Pentateuch stated that some concepts were early and some late when this was not based on any objective fact found in a standard by which to compare their documents but from the

subjective supposition that the concept had to develop in Israel as in other tribes and races. Doctor Allis summed up their supposition thus,

That the history of Israel, especially the religious history, must have followed in general the same pattern as that of other nations and races and that the theory of naturalistic evolution must be applied to all without exception.²¹³

A portion from Briggs' application of the argument showed Doctor Allis's statement to be the critics' view.

The humanitarianism of Dt. may be best explained from the experience of the troublous times from Hezekiah till Josiah. The prophet Amos repeatedly rebukes the oppressors of the poor...and this oppression is forbidden in Ex... The prophet Isaiah emphasizes the wrongs of the fatherless and widows. But no prophet before Jeremiah seems to be concerned with the oppression of the stranger. The terms (Ex.xx.10; Deut.v.14, Decalogue; Ex. xxii. 20; xxiii.9, 12, Covenant Code) are Deuteronomic redactions. But Deuteronomy combines "the stranger and the fatherless and the widow" xiv.29; xvi. 11, 14; xix. 20, 21; ...a phrase used nowhere else... But Dt. also thinks of the stranger alone...and so Jeremiah first among the prophets...and then Ezek...Mal. It is evident that ethically the Deuteronomic Code rises higher than Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, and prepares the way for Jeremiah and Ezekiel.²¹⁴

It was apparent that Briggs built on the assumption that the Prophets, Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, came before the law of Deuteronomy. It was not an objective analysis of the Prophets and then a comparison with the concept as found in the Pentateuch, as would have been necessary to comply with the argument from theology. Furthermore, the very fact that Briggs had to rely on redactional notes in Exodus to make the whole fit the scheme was actually destructive to

the whole argument. For all evidence had to be consistent with the argument or it was self-destructive.

It was easy to use supposition as to when different rites, ceremonies, and especially language connected with these arose, but the authenticity of a book or part of a book can be contradicted only by known substantiated facts that are certain. In reality the argument from viewpoint was closely related to the historical argument in that it centered around the historical setting of opinions. To refute a work on the basis of opinion and ideals in the realm of subjectivity would necessitate a history of every realm of life exact to the minute detail as a standard by which to compare and graduate. This standard was not available outside the Pentateuch and no inward standard remained after the atomizing of the critics to fit their theories.

D. Miscellaneous Arguments Examined

Under this heading were considered the various methods of such Higher Criticism that were not adopted from former criticism but originated by critics of the Bible. There were mainly two: The Doublet Theory; And redaction by unknown editors.

Doublet Theory. The alleged Doublet theory is one of the theories which has come forth from the school of Higher Criticism. The theory is that a number of events have been related more than once in the Pentateuch. Which parallel accounts are claimed to be duplication which could only be the result of combining two or more documents and therefore proof of composite authorship. This was not,

strictly speaking, then, a method of Higher Criticism but in reality a phenomenon which the critics claimed was an argument of more than one original source. There was no record of such an argument having been used in former criticism of ancient writings. From the logical standpoint it was a theory until proved fact, and this would have only been possible if documents were found as evidence of the case in point. The doublets were used as a basis for the literary argument as shown previously in this Chapter.²¹⁵ The main doublet the critics claimed was Genesis 1:1-2:4a and Genesis 2:4b-25 which was shown above to be an erroneous distinction. Doctor Briggs set forth what he considered to be eleven of such doublet or triplicate narratives in the Pentateuch: Creation, Deluge, Decalogue, Peril of midwives, The twelve stones at Jordan, Two of murrain and insect pests in the plagues, The call and blessing of Abraham, Rebellion in the wilderness, Water from the rock, and Moses' assistants.²¹⁶ Driver located sixteen however, and Wellhausen and Dillmann pushed the number of such doublets to extravagance.²¹⁷ Doctor Green stated, after the discussion and setting aside of several supposed doublets, that they can be set aside in detail and are the result of "measuring ancient oriental narratives by the rules of modern occidental discourse."²¹⁸ Doctor Allis very clearly manifested that the division into double narratives was comparatively easy because of "two very marked features of the Biblical (Hebraic) style."²¹⁹

The first of these features is syntactical: the frequency with which loosely compounded sentences (complete sentences joined by 'and') occur in the Old Testament. Genesis 1. is an illustration of this. ...The second feature of the Biblical style which readily lends itself to source analysis is the frequency

with which elaboration and repetition occurs
in the Bible.²²⁰

Repetition was native to the very expressive nature of the Hebrew language, being the Hebrew way of emphasis. This extended from the doubling of a verb for emphasis, such as, "blessing I will bless thee," "multiplying I will multiply thy seed"²²¹ to the doubling of phrases, and narratives. Thus repetitions were not meaningless as Eichhorn and others have said, but was the Hebrew style to bring emphasis on that which was repeated.²²² These critics have claimed that the separate ideas afforded two complete narratives but when the results were examined this was far from complete. As MacDill said regarding the J narrative of the flood, "it can scarcely be realized how abrupt, broken, and incoherent this account is, because the reader will supply ideas which have been made familiar to him by reading the full account."²²³

The examination of the J flood document revealed that God commanded Noah and his family to go into the ark, though no instructions had been given for its building nor yet anything said about the members of Noah's family.²²⁴ "J gives no information as to what the ark was, or who made it, or whether it was made at all until near the close, where it is incidentally stated that Noah made it."²²⁵ As Doctor Allis so aptly put it, "If the critics are to be followed all the way on this line, one is left in doubt as to whether the writer "J" did not know anything about this great boat or whether his description of it was simply discarded when the documents were combined."²²⁶ Chapter seven needs precisely the statement of 6:9-22 (which is assigned to P) to render it complete and compre-

hensible. The phrase, "And Jehovah shut him in" 7:16b, was placed immediately following 7:12 in J and stands dislocated and alone. Thus repetitions were not to be found in every part of the narrative and a plain reading of the two documents manifested that neither was a complete whole. The divisions made by the critics caused the accounts to appear contradictory.

The examination of the doublet theory revealed that it was not an application of any method of criticism but rather a dividing of narratives which contain much repetition in the Hebrew style of emphasis. Although the Hebrew style did lend itself to division the attempt to separate the historical accounts into two distinct coherent stories was a failure, for each account needed the other to form a complete record. The contradictions which were cited to prove the theory of composite authorship would have largely disappeared if an attempt had been made to see the harmony and unity in the repeated factual accounts and thus to discover the reasons for repetition and emphasis given.²²⁷

Redactors. There was a precedent in secular criticism of ancient writings for some editing, but none on the scale of the plan proposed by the critics of the Pentateuch. The scheme of redaction which was introduced by Hupfeld was at first very simple, mainly that three or perhaps four documents were put together by a redactor, who added only a few connecting words and phrases. But this was eventually enlarged to include a school of redactors who edited material for both J and E then conflated them, the product of which was years later redacted with D and eventually with P and H. The redactor was considered to have used a free hand in making elaborations and changes

in some places yet in others used the sources precisely as found at the cost of error or repetition. The summation of the redaction process was given by Doctor Simpson in The Interpreter's Bible:

It is thus impossible to speak of any strict sense of the author of Genesis. The Redactor--RP--who conflated JE and P has the best claim to be so regarded, for he determined the form of the book. Yet even his work received certain additions...²²⁸

Driver gave the following comment on the way the supposed redactor worked:

J and E were combined into a whole by a compiler whose method of work, sometimes incorporating long sections of each intact (or nearly so), sometimes fusing the parallel accounts into a single narrative...The whole thus formed (JE) was afterwards combined with the narrative P by a second compiler, who, adopting P as his frame work, accommodated JE to it, omitting in either what was necessary in order to avoid needless repetition, and making such slight redactional adjustments as the unity of his work required.²²⁹

Briggs also held that at times the unknown redactors made full extracts from each document but that at other times he made additions, modifications, and explanatory remarks. Thus the redactor or school of redactors were very skillful and yet they left in the received text many inconsistencies and incongruities which the critics have had to set right.

It seemed appropriate to give several of the examples where recourse was made to redactional notes. Driver conceded that though Genesis 5:2-5, 9-28 was primarily P yet there was a foreign element, "and must thus have been derived, most probably by the compiler, from a different source."²³⁰ Again, Driver had to allude to the compiler

because of the omissions from P of the birth of Esau and Jacob and Jacob's life in Paddan-Aram which were nevertheless presupposed by the document.²³¹ Doctor Briggs had to make the greatest concession though, in his three strongest arguments from language. In regard to exceptions in the use of the personal pronoun he said, "The apparent contradictions in Deuteronomy are due to different original documents which have been incorporated..."²³² Secondly, in regard to the two exceptions on the use of the word for capital punishment, he wrote, "both of which are probably redactional."²³³ Thirdly, in regard to the exception of death by stoning as it fitted the theory he wrote, "The single example of this...must be due to a later copyist substituting unconsciously a later for an earlier verb."²³⁴

Perhaps the strongest and most fatal referral to the redactor was in The Interpreter's Bible, because it hit at the very heart of the foundation of the whole system of division. The statement by Doctor Simpson was: "Using the names employed in referring to or addressing the Deity as our criterion--though allowance must be made for occasional redaction alteration..."²³⁵

Earlier in the paper examples were given of where Elohim appeared in the Jehovah sections and visa versa, these were explained as redactional notes also, thus the reference to the redactors work amounted mainly to tampering with the evidence. The very fact that recourse had to be made to redactors, when no such person was mentioned or alluded to in the Pentateuch itself, or anywhere in connection with it, to take care of omissions and criterion that did not fit the theory of the documents was fatal to the whole hypothesis.

E. The Bias of the Critics

It was apparent from the first that there was a great human element that must enter into the use of the methods of Higher Criticism. The methods themselves were powerless to point to the right solution unless used by men who did not allow their own personal bias to color their findings. The very subjectivity of the methods that were applicable to the Pentateuch made this of paramount importance. In the words of Professor Zeno,

Methods are but instruments. They may be used properly or improperly. They derive their efficiency from him who uses them. Success in their use depends altogether on the equipment of the user. And this equipment is to be found in the user's tone of spirit and previous preparation and state of mind.²³⁶

The critical scholars made a great appeal for others to be objective in their thinking and to cast off their previous notions of the traditional theories that they might accept what critical scholarship had to offer. However no thinking person would be right in accepting the results of criticism without examining their personal bias that influenced their study.

Doctor Briggs started his Pentateuch studies in Germany under the teaching of the eminent conservative scholar Hengstenberg, but because he did not agree with the conservative approach he turned to the guidance of the higher critic Koediger and later Ewald. Thus in his foundational studies of the Pentateuch Briggs admitted he received the instruction in critical methods which would tend to bias him. He expressed his personal bias as an Evangelical critic, thus,

"In the conflict of opinion, evangelical critics will waive their opinions as to the divine authority of this testimony, but in their own convictions, critical work, and teachings they will not waive them."²³⁷ However, by "Divine authority" Briggs did not mean the authority of an infallible Word of God, that the conservative scholar meant, for this was inconsistent with the supposed redactional errors and the questionable history that these critics cited.

Some of the bias of this type of higher criticism was evident in the fact that Wellhausen, Kuenen, Graf, Pfeiffer, and others, including the authors of The Interpreter's Bible, tenaciously held to naturalistic, evolutionary philosophy. This was clearly shown by the criticism Briggs leveled against the Wellhausen position in the section above and also their own quotes that follow below.

First, from The Interpreter's Bible: "The story of the growth of the Hebrew literature is in no fundamental way different from that of literature among other peoples..."²³⁸ The real force of this statement was caught when it was realized that its basis was the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen theory. Kuenen himself stated, "The religion of Israel is for us one of the great religions of the world; neither more nor less."²³⁹ And as shown by a previous quote these critics believed that the religion of Israel was purely naturalistic, beginning with polytheism and proceeding unto monotheism.

Secondly, Doctor Pfeiffer's opening statement confirms this bias, "The Old Testament owes its origin primarily to the religious aspirations of the Jews...the canonization of the Pentateuch was dictated by the religious needs of the Jewish community."²⁴⁰

When the methods were applied by those who were biased against

supernaturalism the results would naturally be questionable. The very fact that the Bible claims to be the divinely revealed Word of God made the counter claim on the defensive. That is, because the Bible claims to be supernatural, the scientific approach would have had to have been to accept this until proven false; and this has never been done. The bias of the critics having been what it was, caused them to attempt to make all criteria fit the hypothesis rather than an hypothesis to fit the criteria. This resulted in endless confusion and criticism amongst the critics of the Pentateuch, as shown below. But as Mr. Fitchett remarked, "Higher Criticism, of course does not pretend to be an exact science. Science has its ascertained and verified certainties, which stand good through all debates and are accepted universally as final."²⁴¹ This was a fair statement as was also the following, "The unwritten law of the Higher Criticism is that every critic has the right to frame the theory which best satisfies his own personal judgment. There are no central and universally admitted facts by which all theories must be true and to which all must conform."²⁴²

These critics even severely criticized each other's stand and results of application. After listing the conclusions and position of a number of critics, Doctor Briggs said: "Some of them like Spinoza, were animated by a spirit more or less hostile to the evangelical faith."²⁴³ He said of the very earliest critics, "They all made the mistake of proposing untenable theories of various kinds to account for the facts, instead of working upon the facts and rising from them by induction and generalization to permanent results."²⁴⁴ Briggs said of Eichhorn's analysis, "his analysis has been the basis of

all critical investigation since his day...but he sometimes chased shadows..."²⁴⁵

In criticism of the fragmentary hypothesis Briggs warned that it was "also advocated by A. T. Hartmann, Von Bohlen, and others. It was radical and destructive theory that called forth the determined opposition of all earnest men and it was soon overthrown."²⁴⁶ And again in his comment of the supplementary hypothesis and those who constructed it he said:

we must distinguish between the theory and the facts upon which it is grounded. We should not allow ourselves to be influenced by the circumstances that many of the scholars who have been engaged in these researches have been rationalistic or semi-rationalistic in their religious opinions; and that they have employed the methods and styles peculiar to the German scholarship of our century.²⁴⁷

And finally Briggs gave the following attack on some of the critics who held to the development hypothesis, which was used as the basis of The Interpreter's Bible:

Wellhausen, like Kuenen, attacks the historical character of the Pentateuch, denies the supernatural element, and re-constructs in the most arbitrary manner--but these features are personal, and have no necessary connection with his critical analysis of the literary documents and legislation of the Pentateuch, so that men of every shade of opinion with regard to supernatural and to evangelical religion may be found among the advocates of the theory.²⁴⁸

Doctor Driver, who was a very highly regarded critic, held that the remainder of Genesis after separation of P belonged to J and E together, which were very difficult to separate. In this he disagreed heartily with Dillmann, distinguishing minutely between

J and E. He commented:

Dillmann attempts to separate J and E with great minuteness. But it is often questionable if the phraseological criteria upon which he mainly relies warrant the conclusions which he draws from them. He is apt (as present writer ventures to think) not to allow sufficiently for the probability that two writers, whose general styles were such as those of J and E are known to have been, would make use of the same expressions where these expressions are not (as in the case of P) of a peculiar, strongly marked type, but are such as might be used so far as we can judge, by an writer of the best historical style.²¹⁹

Thus Driver recognized and exposed weaknesses in Dillmann's analysis and that it did not accord with the true principles of literary criticism on three counts: (1) Distinction was made on minute points, not on the overall work as necessary according to the original argument. (2) The use of questionable phraseological criteria. (3) Failure to recognize that writers were capable of expressing themselves in more than one way; likewise, two authors able to express themselves in like terms. It was particularly noted that Briggs followed Dillmann in his fine analysis between J and E. Therefore Briggs was actually in conflict on this main analysis with Driver, his co-laborer in the International Critical Commentary. The criticism which Driver leveled against Dillmann in his use of the principle of style and diction variation may be turned upon Driver himself in his analysis of the different documents on such flimsy evidence. Thus the above examination has shown that the critics were not only biased in their application of the principles but that this bias caused considerable disagreement between them. The author in The Interpreter's Bible, pointed out these differences by saying, "Even among prominent scholars

opinions differ widely, all the way from a relative conservatism to a belief that the stories have grown up in a way typical of most early traditions."²⁵⁰

F. Summary and Conclusion

Summary. This chapter was an examination of the methods used by Higher Criticism and the application of those same methods. The literary method was found to be very subjective in character and that the real key to its successful use could lie only in having a standard by which to establish the style of an author. It was discovered that difference in style could be attributed to experience or age of author, different periods of composition, different authors, different subject matter, or assistants used. Though acknowledged, these various possibilities were never considered as alternatives in the application. The variation in Divine names and supposed doublets were the basis of the literary argument. The variation in Divine names was found to be inconsistent with the theory if the evidence was not tampered with and the doublets to be a misunderstanding of the Hebrew repetition. The actual establishment of style of the four alleged documents was accomplished either by an examination of the material separated by the criteria of divine names or by the erroneous interpretation of Exodus 6:2, 3. Thus it was "in toto" a circular argument which used criteria to distinguish the documents and then arrayed that same criteria with other minute differences as proof of the various documents. No proof was found that the methods of Higher Criticism had ever been verified for this type of crit-

icism by their former use, in fact, the whole usage was contrary to the necessity of having a standard of style by which to proceed. The use of the literary argument was the most important because it was the basis of all the others, the arguments stand or fall on the validity of the method and its application to the Pentateuch.

The historical argument was also found to be very subjective in character and wholly dependent on the literary argument. The one very necessary requirement for the proper use of the argument was missing, namely, a cognisant contemporary historical background. The application of the argument dealt mostly with the alleged anachronisms which appeared as a result of either misinterpretation of scripture or the illusion caused by dividing the Pentateuch into documents. The argument from silence was found to yield only "probabilities" and that many facts were overlooked by the critics in its use. The whole application of the historical argument was under great supposition because of the underlying bias of the critics, who held that the history of Israel had to fit into a prescribed naturalistic system.

The theological argument was only taken as corroborative and entirely dependent on the literary partitioning. It was even more subjective in application than the others and applied with the assumption that viewpoints expressed must fit a prescribed pattern of development. Throughout the application of this argument as well as with the others allowance was made by the critics for redactional notes and changes to alleviate difficulties that did not square with the proposed hypothesis.

The subjective arguments were furthermore applied by scholars who were considerably biased in their viewpoint and much disagreement

which was more apparent in later criticism.

Conclusion. Inasmuch as the methods were very subjective in character a proper standard of measurement for style and historical background was an absolute essential to proper use. The external history and certified writing from which to establish ground for the arguments were missing. When the bias under which the methods were applied was added to this it made it conclusive that the results of the application were purely subjective and not a valid basis for the partitioning of the Pentateuch into documents.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

A. Summary

This study has included a historical survey of the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, a historical study of the methods used by the critics of the Pentateuch, and an examination of the arguments and their application.

The historical study of Higher Criticism brought to light that the traditional theory of Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was accepted by all but a very few outside of Judaism and Christianity until after the Reformation. Prior to the Reformation a number of scholars found statements in the Pentateuch which they felt were hard to understand in the light of Mosaic authorship, the main one of these being, the record of Moses' death in the last chapter of Deuteronomy. The Reformation raised the question of the authority and authenticity of the Bible in general and especially the Pentateuch. The Destructive Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, for all practical purposes, commenced with Jean Astruc in 1753. Since that time there were seven distinct hypotheses set forth by these critics of the Pentateuch, each of which was contradictory on some points to the former and yet by most of these critics considered to be an advanced proposition. Though most Biblical scholars, who disregard Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, accept some form of the docu-

mentary theory of the relationship of J, E, D, P, yet there is wide disagreement as to what constitutes the documents and their dates of composition and redaction. Until the twentieth century, the critics have tended to date the documents post-exilic and to deny the historicity of most of the Pentateuch; but twentieth century criticism has been dating the documents earlier, locating other minor documents, and sowing seed ideas that would in reality undermine the whole documentary theory. The whole documentary position was not nearly so secure at the mid-century mark as it was on the eve of the twentieth century. The most extensive critical work of the twentieth century, which will no doubt do much to further the documentary hypothesis, was The Interpreter's Bible. It was based entirely on the documentary hypothesis both in the introductory articles and in its exegesis. And it followed throughout the developmental interpretation of the hypothesis as set forth by Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen.

Higher Criticism of the Bible borrowed its lines of inquiry and methods of ascertaining evidence from the humanists of the renaissance, who investigated ancient and ecclesiastical writings. Higher Criticism, both Biblical and non-Biblical, sought to establish the following of any writing: Integrity; Authenticity; Literary features; and Credibility. A few have even questioned the right to apply these tests to sacred writings; but most scholars, both liberal and conservative, have realized that it was a proper field of investigation in order to have a defense against false religions and agnosticism. There were three main methods used to discover evidence for this investigation: The literary method; The historical

method; and the theological method. The critics did not just adopt the methods as they had been promulgated by the humanists but developed slowly a similar pattern of methods or arguments. The literary argument was the first developed by critics of the Pentateuch. It centered around the establishment of the diction, vocabulary, and general style of writing used by an author. The second stage emphasized the historical argument, which examined a writing as to the history it pictured as compared with the actual time of writing. The last phase combined the former two with an examination of the viewpoints, expressed in the writing as to their development and historical setting. These three arguments were supported by six lines of evidences: The time the writing portrays; The style of the writing; The opinions expressed; Internal citations; External citations; and Silence. The earlier critics based their work almost "in toto" on literary arguments while the later critics relied heavily on the historical and theological arguments. In the twentieth century great stress has been laid on the arguments of silence and citation, especially to show development of the history and concepts of the Jewish nation. Thus Biblical Higher Criticism has not originated new methods of criticism but has adapted former methods in a pattern peculiar to the situation of the Pentateuch.

The value of the methods and their application were examined in chapter IV. It was not substantiated that the methods had been formerly verified as reliable in discovering original documents. The type of detailed analysis that was applied to the Pentateuch was an original use of the methods with no recorded precedent. All of the methods were found to be subjective in nature and requiring a full

knowledge and understanding of the time of the writing in order to be of any worth. The literary method was found to be questioned most by destructive critics and conservative critics as to its trustworthiness. It was the essential foundation on which the other arguments had to rest, and yet was very subjective in its very character and application. Differences in style could have been attributed to a variety of different things but these critics seemed to consider only the one possibility, that of different authorship. It was plain that the former use of the principle had been with writings where the style of the supposed author could be gleaned from well authenticated works. The nature of style was such that it could not be established from short passages and excerpts.

The historical argument could yield very concrete evidence when there was sufficient historical background to compare the writing in question. The argument as applied to the Pentateuch was very subjective because of this lack of an external standard. The critics therefore compared the portions that they had previously separated on the linguistic grounds and called it a corroborative argument. The result was that anachronisms appeared because of the partitionings that were not on the surface of the Pentateuch as a whole. The reliability of the application of this argument was under suspicion because the majority of the later critics were biased toward evolutionary philosophy. Therefore the critics arranged the history of the Jews in a developmental scheme to conform to their theory that all nations and tribes evolved.

The critics used the theological argument to show that there was a difference of opinions in the alleged documents. It was also

used to corroborate the literary and historical arguments. The theological concepts of the Pentateuch were so arranged that it gave the appearance of continuous development from the earlier material to the later sources. However, this was a forced application of the principle as it existed in non-Biblical criticism because as the humanist used it a writer's viewpoint was ascertained from works authenticated to be his.

There appeared to be three disturbing elements in the whole application of the principles. First, there was the obvious fact that over and over again the critics had to rely on the redactor as a "scape-goat" to account for evidence that did not fit with their hypothesis. Secondly, the arguments were circular, in that the original sources were separated on the basis of criteria that afterwards was arranged in proof of the documents. Thirdly, the majority of the critics who applied the methods were biased toward rationalism or naturalistic philosophy, which colored their findings and results. The variety of hypotheses and the disagreement of the critics on main points made the results questionable.

B. Conclusions

General Conclusions 1. The historical study uncovered evidence that much of the work of Destructive Higher Criticism was based on the rationalism of Hobbes and the evolutionary philosophy of Hegel.

2. Much of the analysis of Destructive Higher Criticism was done on assumption to fit preconceived hypotheses without following clear methods.

3. Higher Criticism of the Bible had a forerunner in the criticism of ancient and ecclesiastical writings. Certain methods or principles of investigation were developed for that area of study.

4. There was a distinct difference between the historical background and literary surroundings of the Bible and the other writings that had been investigated previously.

5. The critics of the Bible did not just adopt the methods of criticism as used by the humanists but slowly evolved their own methods which run quite parallel to those used to investigate ancient and ecclesiastical writings.

6. The methods or principles developed by the Destructive Higher Critics were very subjective in nature. Therefore an acknowledged standard of measurement for style, and an historical background was an absolute essential to their proper use.

7. There were no other writings of the period of the Pentateuch from which to establish historical background or ascertain the style of the writers; therefore these methods were inappropriate for giving concrete evidence in examination of the Pentateuch.

8. These methods or principles used by Destructive Higher Criticism were not verified by their former use for proving either that the Pentateuch came from pre-existing documents or the extent of the supposed documents.

9. The Destructive Higher Critics were not impartial but worked under the handicap of a definite bias against Mosaic authorship and the historicity of the Pentateuch.

10. No two critics have applied the methods in the very same manner or come to the same exact conclusion. There is only general

agreement among the critics as to the extent of the documents and the time of writing. On specific points there is much disagreement which is widening in recent years.

Specific Conclusions. 1. The prevailing developmental hypothesis was built on an anti-supernatural bias which makes it particularly objectionable.

2. The results of Destructive Higher Criticism were so far reaching and destructive of the authority of the Bible as to its history and the details that no honest student of the Word of God could accept them without serious question. These critics claim to retain the religious authority of the Bible while holding it is erroneous in history and a fabrication of sources from unknown authors.

3. It is a rank contradiction to hold that the Pentateuch is historically inaccurate and yet claim that it has authority in its religious message.

4. Because of the subjective nature of the methods their use brings to light only implications and probabilities and not objective evidence which could be relied upon.

5. The majority of the so-called anachronisms and errors that the Destructive Higher Critics have pointed out were a result of their partitioning of the Pentateuch in their preliminary application of the literary methods, and do not exist when the Pentateuch is taken as a whole with an attempt to harmonize the facts given.

6. The collective or aggregate evidence for the supposed documents is no stronger than its "weakest link", and that "weakest link" is the literary argument, which is the most subjective and

unreliable of all arguments, yet it is the basis of all the others.

7. The subjectivity of the methods combined with the human element of the critics to so effect the evaluation of their findings within a large circle of uncertainty that their conclusions were unreliable.

8. The documentary analysis of the Pentateuch into J, E, D, P, was unsatisfactory because of three serious defects: (1) The principles for locating evidences were too unreliable to give substantial facts. (2) The arguments were circular in form. (3) There was no possible way to have external setting by which to compare the supposed sources.

C. The Suggestions for Further Study

Further research is needed to determine the value of critical methods as to their use in connection with non-Biblical literature of both ancient and modern times.

Further study is also in order as to the examination of the methods and their application to the remainder of the Old Testament and the New Testament.

Another approach to this problem would be a study in which the methods would be applied to the various books of the Pentateuch in a conservative positive approach. In this way each book of the Pentateuch would be compared with each of the other books of the Pentateuch, that is, compare the whole of Genesis with Exodus, then both with Leviticus, and the whole with Numbers and Deuteronomy on the basis of these critical methods. All this would be done with a view

to the harmony rather than disunity and partitioning of the Pentateuch. The author does not claim that even this would be like the non-Biblical use of the principles, nor that the results would be ironclad. This type of application would be more in accord with the former usage and would reveal the genuine internal characteristics of the books as they now stand in the Bible.

FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES

1. Andrew C. Zenos, The Elements of the Higher Criticism (New York, Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1895), p. 4.
2. Ibid., p. 9.
3. Edward J. Young, An Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), p. 109. (Doctor Young's doctoral thesis on Biblical Criticism to the End of the Second Christian Century, which is unpublished).
4. Zenos, p. 176.
5. Young, p. 110.
6. Ibid., p. 112.
7. Ibid., p. 113.
8. Ibid., p. 114.
9. Ibid., p. 115.
10. Ibid.
11. Zenos, p. 178.
12. Young, p. 116.
13. Ibid. (work not extant now)
14. Genesis 35:14; Deuteronomy 34:5, 6. (Jerome was using the originals.)
15. Young, p. 117.
16. Ibid.
17. Zenos, p. 178.
18. Genesis 12:6; 22:11; Deuteronomy 1:1; 3:11.
19. Charles Augustus Briggs, Biblical Study (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883), p. 106.
20. Charles Augustus Briggs, The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), p. 36.
21. Edward McQueen Gray, Old Testament Criticism Its Rise and Progress (New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1923), p. 52.
22. Canon Dyson Hague, "The History of Higher Criticism," The Fundamentals (Los Angeles, The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, 1917), I, 14.
23. Ibid., I, 15.
24. He is the same as Le Clerc.
25. Hague, I, 15.
26. Young, p. 120.
27. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 46.
28. Young, p. 121.
29. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 50.
30. Young, p. 123.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid., p. 125.
33. Ibid.
34. II Kings 22:8.
35. Young, p. 129.
36. William Henry Green, The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), p. 82.
37. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 65.
38. Ibid., p. 63.

39. Ibid., p. 67.
40. Young, p. 136.
41. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 62f.
42. Young, p. 137.
43. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 66.
44. Ibid.
45. Hague, I, 18.
46. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 90.
47. Zenos, p. 203.
48. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 90.
49. Young, p. 138.
50. Zenos, p. 205.
51. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 93.
52. Zenos, p. 205.
53. Young, p. 138.
54. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 94.
55. Ibid., p. 94f. (Doctor Briggs called it the school of Reuss because Edward Reuss was the instructor of Wellhausen.)
56. Ibid., p. 95f.
57. Ibid., p. 137f.
58. Young, p. 143.
59. Ibid., p. 145.
60. Ibid., p. 146.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid., p. 147.
63. Ibid., p. 148.
64. Ibid., p. 149.
65. Guthbert A. Simpson, "The Growth of the Hexateuch," The Interpreter's Bible (New York, Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1952), I, 191.
66. Ibid., p. 192.
67. Ibid.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid., p. 193.
71. Ibid., p. 194.
72. Ibid., p. 193.
73. James Muilenburg, "The History of the Religion of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible, I, 295f.
74. E. L. Allen, "Criticism and Faith," The Review of Religion, March, 1953, Vol. XVII, nos. 3-4, p. 145.
75. Ibid.
76. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 94.
77. Zenos, The Elements of Higher Criticism, p. 43.
78. Briggs, Biblical Study, p. 87.
79. L. E. Du Pin, New History of Ecclesiastical Writers, quoted in Briggs, Biblical Study, p. 87ff.
80. Ibid.
81. Zenos, p. 48.
82. Ibid., p. 4.
83. Gray, Old Testament Criticism, p. 52.
84. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 4.

85. Rene Wells and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1949), p. 9.
86. Briggs, Biblical Study, p. 92.
87. Du Pin, quoted in Briggs, Biblical Study, p. 89.
88. Ibid., p. 88.
89. Ibid., p. 89.
90. Ibid.
91. Ibid., p. 90.
92. Zenos, p. 50.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid., p. XIII.
95. Ibid., p. 50.
96. Ibid., p. 51.
97. Ibid., p. 52.
98. Ibid., p. 53.
99. Ibid., p. 54.
100. Gray, Old Testament Criticism, p. 52.
101. Ibid., p. 53.
102. Ibid.
103. Young, An Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 121.
104. Zenos, The Elements of Higher Criticism, p. 191.
105. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 162.
106. Gray, p. 139.
107. Ibid., p. 145.
108. Briggs, Biblical Study, p. 170.
109. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 49.
110. Zenos, p. 195.
111. Gray, p. 35.
112. Zenos, p. 197.
113. Ibid., p. 67.
114. Ibid., p. 71.
115. Ibid., p. 74f.
116. Ibid., p. 91.
117. Ibid.
118. W. Robertson Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church (London, Adam and Charles Black, 1895), p. 390.
119. Ibid.
120. S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. XVIII.
121. Zenos, The Elements of Higher Criticism, p. 102.
122. Ibid.
123. Ibid., p. 103.
124. Ibid.
125. Ibid., p. 104.
126. Ibid., p. 106.
127. Ibid., p. 203.
128. Ibid.
129. Young, An Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 141.
130. Briggs, Biblical Study, p. 58f.
131. Ibid., p. 91.
132. Driver, p. 8.
133. W. Robertson Smith, p. 16.

134. Ibid., p. 390.
135. Ibid.
136. George Adam Smith, Modern Criticism of the Old Testament (New York, A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1901), pp. 41, 46.
137. Simpson, The Interpreter's Bible, p. 188.
138. Ibid., pp. 185ff.
139. Ibid., p. 190.
140. Ibid., p. 200.
141. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 4.
142. Zeno, pp. 56, 105.
143. Ibid., p. 58.
144. Ibid., p. 60.
145. Geerhardus Vos, The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes (New York, A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1886), p. 19.
146. Ibid., pp. 21ff.
147. R. W. Rishell, The Higher Criticism (Cincinnati, Curtis and Jennings, 1896), p. 29.
148. Zeno, p. 65.
149. George Adam Smith, p. 48.
150. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 47.
151. Ibid., p. 49.
152. Ibid., p. 47.
153. Ibid., p. 48.
154. Simpson, The Interpreter's Bible, p. 189.
155. Ibid.
156. Young, p. 134.
157. Green, p. 91ff.
158. Ibid., p. 96, quoted from Hebraica, by Dr. Harper.
159. Ibid.
160. Ibid., p. 97.
161. Driver, p. 8.
162. Ibid., p. 12.
163. Ibid., p. 11.
164. Young, p. 146.
165. Driver, p. 13.
166. Ibid.
167. Ibid., p. 15.
168. Simpson, The Interpreter's Bible, p. 189.
169. Ibid.
170. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 69. (listed in Driver's Introduction to Literature of Old Testament, 5 ed., 1894, in appendix II; this ed. was not available but the same list is presumably given by Briggs Appendix II.)
171. Driver, p. 126.
172. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 69.
173. Ibid., p. 74.
174. Ibid.
175. Ibid., pp. 70ff.
176. Ibid., p. 74.
177. Green, p. 116.
178. Ibid., p. 116.
179. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 20f.

180. James Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), p. 231.
181. Ibid., p. 232.
182. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 4.
183. Zenos, p. 67.
184. Ibid., p. 68.
185. Ibid., p. 71.
186. Briggs, Biblical Study, p. 89f.
187. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 13.
188. Ibid., pp. 12, 48.
189. Ibid., p. 11.
190. Ibid., pp. 36-39.
191. Ibid., p. 38f.
192. Josephus' Antiquities, quoted in D. MacDill, The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch (Ohio, W. J. Shuey, 1896), p. 39.
193. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 37.
194. Green, p. 50f.
195. Briggs, Biblical Study, p. 91.
196. Zenos, p. 75.
197. Bacon, Genesis of Genesis, quoted in Zenos, p. 79.
198. Zenos, pp. 80-83.
199. Ibid., pp. 88-91.
200. Ibid., p. 90.
201. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 123f.
202. W. Robertson Smith, pp. 256, 259.
203. Ibid., p. 276.
204. Orr, p. 299.
205. Ibid., p. 300.
206. MacDill, p. 190.
207. Zenos, p. 105.
208. Ibid., pp. 106, 113.
209. Ibid., p. 109.
210. Kishell, p. 41.
211. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, pp. 146-155.
212. Ibid., p. 155.
213. Oswald T. Allis, The Five Books of Moses (Philadelphia, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1943), p. VI.
214. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 85f.
215. See page 76.
216. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, pp. 75-88.
217. Green, p. 112.
218. Ibid., p. 113.
219. Allis, p. 94.
220. Ibid., p. 94f.
221. Numbers 22:17, R. S. V.
222. Allis, p. 98.
223. MacDill, p. 106.
224. John Howard Raven, Old Testament Introduction (New York, Fleming H. Revell Company, 1906), p. 125.
225. MacDill, p. 106.
226. Allis, p. 96.
227. Ibid., p. 97.
228. Kullenburg, The Interpreter's Bible, I, 140.

- 229. Driver, p. 20.
- 230. Ibid., p. 11.
- 231. Ibid., p. 12.
- 232. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 70.
- 233. Ibid., p. 72.
- 234. Ibid., p. 73.
- 235. Simpson, The Interpreter's Bible, p. 190.
- 236. Zenos, p. 134.
- 237. Briggs, Biblical Study, p. 173.
- 238. Arthur Jeffery, "The Canon of the Old Testament," The Interpreter's Bible, I, 33.
- 239. Zenos, p. 141.
- 240. Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1948), p. 3.
- 241. W. H. Fitchett, Where the Higher Criticism Fails (New York, The Methodist Book Concern, 1922), p. 19.
- 242. Ibid., p. 21.
- 243. Briggs, Biblical Study, p. 199f.
- 244. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 49.
- 245. Briggs, Biblical Study, p. 205.
- 246. Briggs, The Higher Criticism, p. 58.
- 247. Ibid., p. 67.
- 248. Ibid., p. 94.
- 249. Driver, p. 13 footnote.
- 250. Simpson, The Interpreter's Bible, I, 176.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, E. L., "Criticism and Faith," The Review of Religion (New York, Columbia University Press, March, 1953), Vol. XVII, nos. 3-4.
- Allis, Oswald T., The Five Books of Moses (Philadelphia, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1913).
- , God Spoke by Moses (Philadelphia, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1951).
- Behrends, A. J. F., The Old Testament Under Fire (New York, Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1897).
- Bissell, Edwin Cone, The Pentateuch, Its Origin and Structure (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904).
- Briggs, Charles Augustus, Biblical Study, Its Principles Methods and History (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1883).
- , The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897).
- Driver, S. R., An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905).
- , assisted by H. A. White, "The Book of Leviticus," Polychrome Edition of the Holy Bible (New York, Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1896).
- Fitchett, W. H., Where the Higher Criticism Fails (New York, The Methodist Book Concern, 1922).
- Gray, Edward McQueen, Old Testament Criticism (New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1923).
- Green, William Henry, The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896).
- , The Unity of the Book of Genesis (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897).
- Hague, Canon Dyson, "The History of Higher Criticism," The Fundamentals (Los Angeles, The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, 1917), Vol. I.
- Hutchins, William J., The Religious Experience of Israel (New York, Association Press, 1920).

- Longacre, Lindsay B., The Old Testament Its Form and Purpose (New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1945).
- MacDill, David, The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch (Ohio, W. J. Shuey, 1896).
- McFadyen, John Edgar, Old Testament Criticism and the Christian Church (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903).
- Munhall, L. W., The Highest Critics vs The Higher Critics (New York, Fleming H. Revell Company, 1892).
- Orr, James, The Problem of the Old Testament (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907).
- Pfeiffer, Robert H., Introduction to the Old Testament (New York, Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1948).
- Raven, John Howard, Old Testament Introduction (New York, Fleming H. Revell Company, 1906).
- Reich, Emil, The Failure of the "Higher Criticism" of the Bible (New York, Eaton and Mains, 1905).
- Rishell, Rev. C. W., The Higher Criticism (New York, Eaton & Mains, 1896).
- Smith, George Adam, Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament (New York, A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1901).
- Smith, W. Robertson, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church (London, Adam and Charles Black, 1895).
- The Interpreter's Bible (New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952), Vols. I-II.
- Unger, Merrill F., Introductory Guide to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Zondervan Publishing House, 1951).
- Vos, Geerhardus, The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes (New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1886).
- Welles, Rene and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1949).
- Young, Edward J., An Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953).
- Zenos, Andrew C., The Elements of the Higher Criticism (New York, Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1895).