

5-1-1960

A Critical Introduction to the Book of Genesis

Suk Kim

Recommended Citation

Kim, Suk, "A Critical Introduction to the Book of Genesis" (1960). *Western Evangelical Seminary Theses*. 80.
http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_theses/80

This Thesis 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.

APPROVED BY

Major Professor: Bern M. Warren

Co-operative Reader: Kenneth P. Wesche

Professor of Thesis Form: Nobel V. Sack

A CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOK OF GENESIS

by

Suk Kyoo Kim

A Special

Research Paper

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, 1960

PORTLAND CENTER LIBRARY
GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY
PORTLAND, OR. 97223

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. The Problem	2
B. Justification of the Study	4
C. Limitation	4
D. Definition of the Terms	5
II. THE LIBERAL VIEWS CONCERNING LITERARY SOURCES OF GENESIS	6
A. The History of Criticism Concerning the Origin of Genesis	7
The First Documentary Theory	7
The Fragmentary Hypothesis	9
The Development Hypothesis	10
The New Documentary Hypothesis	11
B. Sources of Genesis Considered	14
Division of Genesis by Driver	14
The Reasons the Documentary Theory is Held	21
The Three Documents in Genesis	23
1. The J Document	23
2. The E Document	25
3. The P Document	27
C. Summary	30

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. THE CONSERVATIVE VIEW CONCERNING LITERARY SOURCES	
OF GENESIS	32
A. The Origin of the Book of Genesis	33
Pure Revelation or Based on Any Sources?	33
Beginning the Practice of Writing Among	
the Hebrews	34
The Sources Moses Used	35
B. Literary Analysis	39
The Variation in the Divine Name	39
The Alleged Parallel Passages	42
Vocabulary and Style.	44
C. Summary	45
IV. THE LIBERAL VIEW CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP OF	
GENESIS	47
A. The Early Opponents' view	48
B. Later Trends	49
C. Modern View	51
D. Summary	54
V. THE CONSERVATIVE VIEW CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP	
OF GENESIS	55
A. The Basis of the Mosaic Tradition	57
The Witness of the Pentateuch Itself	57
The Witness of the Rest of the Old	
Testament	59
The Witness of the New Testament	62

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Voice of Tradition	63
B. What is Meant by Mosaic Authorship? . .	64
C. Summary	66
VI. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE LIBERAL AND CONSERVA-	
TIVE VIEWS	67
A. The Variation in the Divine Names . . .	69
B. Alleged Doublets	73
Two or More Account of the Same Thing	74
Variant Explanation of the Same Name	74
The Creation and the Flood Stories	75
C. The Variation in Diction and Style . . .	76
Peculiarity of Vocabulary	76
Alleged Aramaisms	78
The Variation of Style	79
D. Alleged Anachronisms	80
E. Summary	81
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	83
A. Summary	84
B. Conclusions	86
BIBLIOGRAPHY	87

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Though it is true that the higher, or historical criticism gave little contribution to the field of Biblical study, it has made many Bible students confused.

As soon as the Second World War was ended by the victory of America over Japan, the Korean Church, which suffered by the persecution of Japanese authorities that tried to eradicate Christianity from Korea, and forced Koreans to be the believers of Shintoism which, the Japanese thought, was the best way to assimilate Koreans to them, sprang up with vital revival. In such a good opportunity, the higher criticism was introduced into the Korean Church, and became partially popular among the young ministers and seminary students, and finally it made division in the Presbyterian Churches.

Its dividing movement is now extending to other evangelical denominations thus the higher criticism is spoiling the Korean Church which has been conservative for seventy years of its history. Defending the conservative position from the higher criticism is the most important task of today in Korea.

A. The Problem

For the higher criticism, the Pentateuch is the central area of attack. The genuineness and historical truth of the Books of Moses have been strenuously impugned in the name of the higher criticism. It has

been claimed as one of its most certain results scientifically established, that they have been falsely ascribed to Moses, and were in reality produced at a much later period. It is affirmed that the history is by no means reliable and merely records the uncertain and variant traditions of a post-Mosaic age. Especially, the book of Genesis was a fuse from which the higher criticism was lighted. Jean Astruc, a French physician, is the creator of the modern higher criticism as he called attention to the fact that there were two names, Elohim and Jehovah, for God in Genesis, and asserted that Elohim belonged to an A source and Jehovah to a B source.

Ever since, many scholars were influenced by Astruc's criticism in the study of Genesis, and they in the name of higher criticism began to analyze the book of Genesis, and finally they brought the Documentary Theory and denied the Mosaic authorship. They claimed that the method of the higher criticism was best in the study of the Bible.

Several questions, now, come to the mind of the Bible student as he studies the book of Genesis. What is the liberals view of the literary sources of Genesis? Why do they deny the Mosaic authorship of Genesis? Then, who was the writer of Genesis? What is the conservative view of the literary sources of Genesis? How do they prove the Mosaic authorship of the book against the liberals?

These problems should be solved, and the liberal view versus the conservative view should be compared carefully. Thus, the problems suspected by the liberals would be solved clearly. But this research did not attempt to go further than the problems mentioned above.

B. Justification of the Study

This study is very important to know what the liberals and the conservatives believe concerning the book of Genesis and their approach to the Scriptures for the confused Korean Christians.

This research, of course, did not deal with every problem they have, but still, it will be of great help for the Bible students who are standing between the liberals and the conservatives. They will come to judge which is true and reliable method in the study of the Bible by themselves. The Korean Bible students who are inclined to the higher criticism will come to know by this study that the conservative belief in the Bible is never superstitious or unscientific. They will know the conservative theory is stronger than that of the liberals. They will know the conservative's approach to the Bible is appropriate to follow by the Bible students. This research will affirm the conservative position in the study of the Bible.

C. Limitation

According to the purpose and quality of this study, it was not intended to solve every problem in every detail. It will not touch much about theological problems or the problems arising between the naturalistic evolutionists and fundamental Bible believers. This study always should remain in the introductory area to have the Bible students grasp the liberal and the conservative views concerning the literary sources and the authorship of Genesis.

D. Definition of the Terms

The liberal. This is used as the synonym of the higher critic in this thesis.

The higher critic. The general meaning of this term is the one who studies "the documents themselves with a view to ascertaining their age, character, authorship, sources, the simple or composite nature of the books, and the historical value of the documents."¹ But in this thesis this term means always the radical destructive higher critic.

The conservative. This is the one who "believes in a personal, sovereign God, who created and who governs the universe, and who, when the occasion arises, can work what we know as a miracle to bring about His purpose."² The conservative believes "that the Bible is a supernaturally inspired revelation of God's dealing with His people."³ But the conservative should be distinguished from the radical fundamentalist. The conservative stresses an evangelical piety based on the Bible, but does not usually take any particular stand for or against science, while the fundamentalist does.

¹F. E. Hamilton, The Basis of Christian Faith (New York, Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1946), p. 210.

²S. A. Cartledge, A Conservative Introduction to the Old Testament (Athens, University of Georgia Press, 1944), p. 17.

³Ibid., p. 18.

CHAPTER II

THE LIBERAL VIEW CONCERNING LITERARY SOURCES OF GENESIS

CHAPTER II

THE LIBERAL VIEW CONCERNING LITERARY SOURCES OF GENESIS

A. The History of Criticism Concerning the Origin of Genesis.

Prior to the rise of modern Pentateuchal criticism about 1750 there were a few mild and sporadic denials of the Mosaic authority of the Pentateuch from the Patristic period. However, in the seventeenth century, just before the rationalists began to partition the Pentateuch, attacks upon the Mosaic unity were more pronounced. Cornelius a Lapide (1697), believed Moses wrote a diary which was expanded by Joshua. Isaac de la Peyrere (died 1676) contended that the Pentateuch was redacted from Mosaic sources and other writings. Thomas Hobbes, the English deist (1651) asserted the Pentateuch was a document about Moses rather than by Moses. Benedict Spinoza, the Jewish philosopher (died 1677), maintained the Pentateuch was a later compilation, probably by Ezra. Richard Simon, the Catholic Oratorian (1678) distinguished between the laws attributed to Moses and history, which was composed by the prophets. Thus the history of the critical theory of the origin of the Pentateuch is a long and complicated one, and much has been written upon it. But it is generally recognized that there are four principal stages to be distinguished in it.

The First Documentary Theory

The beginning of the movement of the modern Pentateuchal criticism is usually associated with the French physician Jean Astruc. In 1753 he published anonymously a French book entitled Conjectures on the Original Memoirs Which Moses Seems to Have Used In Composing the Book of Genesis. "The clue discovered by Astruc is given in plain

language in Ex. 6:2-5!"¹ Astruc drew attention to the presence of Elohist and Jehovistic sections in Genesis, and on this based his theory of the employment of distinct documents in the composition of the book. Though Astruc did not deny the Mosaic authorship of Genesis, he, according to the divine names, Yahweh (Jehovah) and Elohim (God, diety), asserted that Elohim belonged to an A source and Yahweh to a B source. "Besides these two main documents Astruc alleged that there were ten other sources of lesser content (C to M)."² These ten sources were "of Medianitic or Arabian origin."³

A further step was taken when Johann Eichhorn, "to whom is due the name Higher Criticism, and who seems to have worked independently of Astruc,"⁴ analyzed Genesis and Exodus 1-2 into sources, which he, in his Einleitung (1780-83), called J and E, after the divine names. These sources, he thought, probably rested upon written traditions, and were pieced together by Moses. Later, however, he gave up the theory of a Mosaic redaction, and asserted that the sources were pieced together by an unknown redactor. Eichhorn pointed out that "the Elohist and Jehovistic sections in Genesis were distinguished, not only simply by the use of the divine names, but by certain other literary peculiarities, which furnished aid in their discrimination."⁵

¹R. H. Pfeiffer, The Books of the Old Testament (New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1949), p. 28.

²M. F. Unger, Introductory Guide to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 1956), p. 243.

³Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 29.

⁴J. Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament (New York, Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959), p. 197.

⁵Orr, loc. cit.

Karl David Ilgen, Eichhorn's successor at the University of Jena, dissected Genesis into seventeen different individual documents, and these he assigned to three different authors, two Elohistes (E¹, E², subsequently called P and E) and one Jehovists.

The Fragmentary Hypothesis

This hypothesis introduced by Alexander Geddes, a Scottish Roman Catholic Priest (1792 and 1800), believed that the Pentateuch was compiled from numerous documents written in the time of Solomon. These fragmentary documents originated from two circles of authors, using Elohim and Yahweh respectively.

Geddes' views were developed and introduced into Germany by Johann Vater in his Kommentar über den Pentateuch (1802-1805). Vater divided the Pentateuch, which, in his opinion, was not finished until the Exile, into numerous disconnected fragments.

Wilhelm Martin Lebrecht De Wette, in his Beilage zur Einleitung ins AT (1806 and 1807), taught that the oldest parts of the Pentateuch belonged to David's time. Originally there were individual, independent fragments, which were pieced together by different compilers. Thus the compiler of Leviticus was a different person from that of Exodus, etc.

With respect to Genesis, De Wette returned to the documentary hypothesis and maintained that the author of Genesis had an Elohim-document which extended at least to Exodus 6, and this he supplemented with excerpts from one or possibly more Jehovistic sources. De Wette ... regarded Genesis as containing a type of epic poem.¹

Heinrich Ewald (1823) stressed the unity of plan and authorship

¹E. J. Young, An Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), p. 126.

of Genesis, "which Vater had broken up into 39 fragments."¹ Certain idioms and expressions, however, he thought, betrayed the unity of the book of Genesis. "Certain characteristics of Genesis also appear in Arabic literature where, for example, one may find repetitions and particular headings within a larger book."² Friedrich Bleek (1822 and 1831) recognized two main redactions; the first by the author of Genesis in the time of the United Kingdom, and the second by the author of Deuteronomy, shortly before 586 B.C. A. T. Hartman (1831) dated most of the Pentateuch during the exilic period, and none of its parts before Solomon. P. von Bohlen (1835) believed that Deuteronomy (621 B.C.) was the oldest part of the Pentateuch. C. P. W. Grandberg (1829) dated Genesis and Exodus between David and Hezekiah, Leviticus and Numbers at the beginning, and Deuteronomy at the end, of the exile. W. Vatke (1835) believed that the Deuteronomic Code, published after the reforms of Josiah, reproduced the essence of the older legislation (Ex. 13:19-24: 32-34), and the Torah (law) originated in a country already supplied with civil laws. J. F. L. George (1835) divided Hebrew literature into three periods: The age of myth (Genesis and parts of Exodus and Numbers), the age of poets and prophets (Deuteronomy) and the age of reason (Levitical Legislation). E. Bertheau (1840) arranged the laws of Exodus-Numbers into seven groups of seven decalogues each, and considered them Mosaic in origin even if not written down by Moses.

The Development Hypothesis

The theory that in the Pentateuch a basic document had been

¹Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 29.

²Young, op. cit., p. 128.

supplimented by other material had been suggested, as already stated in the Fragment Hypothesis, by De Wette, and was clearly presented by H. Ewald (1831). J. J. Stahelm recognized two main sources, the Elohist from the time of Saul and the Jehovistic from the time of David. Ewald found instead Elohist sources reaching from Genesis 1 to Joshua, to which were added fragments of a later Jehovistic source and other writings.¹

The New Documentary Theory

The current analysis of the Pentateuch into its sources was first presented in rudimentary form by Hermann Hupfeld. In his important work, Die Quellen der Genesis (The Sources of Genesis) published at Berlin in 1853, Hupfeld undertook to remove the difficulties of previous theories "by a novel approach, which gained such favor that his views may correctly be said to form the foundation of the modern documentary theory."² According to him the J sections of Genesis were not mere supplementary material to an earlier Elohist sections, he maintained, were, on the other hand, not a continuous document, but rather, were composite, consisting of two documents. This idea had already been advanced by Ilgen, De Wette and, to an extent, by Knobel. There was thus a first Elohist and a second Elohist. "Hupfeld maintained the second Elohist, although employing the divine name Elohim, nevertheless in his language and other characteristics

¹Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 30.

²Unger, op. cit., p. 245.

was closer to the Jehovist than to the first Elohist."¹ These three documents, he thought, were put together into their present form by a redactor. "Hupfeld laid much stress upon the redactor and allowed him great freedom in his work."² The chronological arrangement of the documents by Hupfeld, therefore, was as follows:

1. 1st Elohist (later termed P or Priestly)
2. 2nd Elohist
3. Jehovist
4. Deuteronomy

With respect to Hupfeld's partition of Genesis, certain remarks should be made. In the first place, Hupfeld began his 2nd E at Genesis 20, whereas, his 1st E practically concludes at this point. This looks like the breaking in two of a document that was continuous, especially since the 2nd E seems to presuppose some of the 1st E. At least, the continuity and completeness of the 1st E are destroyed. Another point of importance is that the content of 1st E is largely genealogical, statistical data and extraordinary events, such as the creation, flood, etc. Such material is not the property of any one writer, but is due to the subject matter itself. Again, Hupfeld's insistence that the 2nd E was closer to J than to the 1st E is really clear evidence of the unsatisfaction of the Divine names as criteria for distinguishing documents.³

Pfeiffer, in his book The Books of the Old Testament, said about Hupfeld's theory that,

Its chief weakness was the chronological sequence; it was eventually found that the order was not P, E, J, as Hupfeld had it, but J, E, P. The lateness of the "First Elohist" or "Fundamental Writing" (now called Priestly Code or P), was eventually demonstrated.⁴

¹Young, op. cit., p. 132.

²Young, loc. cit.

³Ibid., p. 132. 133.

⁴Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 30.

August Dillman (1874) and Franz Delitzsch (1880) adopted Hupfeld's theory. But Edward Reuss (1834) maintained that the basic Elohist document (P) was the latest of all the Pentateuchal documents and was elaborated by Ezekiel and the priestly school during the Babylonian exile, being inserted in the other documents to form the Pentateuch. Final redaction was made at the time of Ezra (445 B.C.). J. F. L. George and W. Vatke, through their study of the development of Israel's institutions, had reached the same conclusion independently.

Karl Heinrich Graf, a pupil of Reuss, undertook to give a scientific exposition of his professor's opinion in his critical researches on the historical books of the Old Testament (1866). Deuteronomy, Graf thought, was Josianic, and shows acquaintance with the Jehovist and Elohist but not with the Priestly Code. The order of the documentary sources, therefore, was J.E.D.P. or E.J.D.P. rather than the earlier arrangement P.E.J.D.

The narrative portions of P were shown by J. W. Coleson, Bishop of Natal (1862-1879), to be unhistorical and late; A. Kuenen (died 1891) thought that the First Elohist (P) as a whole, in both its legal and its narrative parts, was postexilic in date.

The publications of Julius Wellhausen (chiefly 1876-1884) led the majority of critics to accept the "Graf-Wellhausen" theory of the sources of the Pentateuch. This theory may be summarized as follows. The J document (about 850 B.C.) and E document (about 750 B.C.) were combined as JE by a redactor, (R^{JE}) about 650 B.C.; the Deuteronomic Code of 621 B. C. D was added by R^D about 400, when the Pentateuch attained substantially its present form. It was soon

recognized, however, among the critics, that none of the four great sources (J.E.D.P.) is really a literary unit. Schrader, Reuss, and Kuenen had doubted the unity of J. before Budde (1883) distinguished J¹ and J² as distinct sources running through the Pentateuch, and O. Eissfeldt (1922) proposed for them the symbols L ("Lay-source") and J. Kuenen distinguished E¹ and E².

In p., Graf identified a separate code, the Holiness Code or H (P^H) in Lev. 17-26, as early as Dr. J. Popper proved that Ex. 35-40 and Lev. 8-10 are later than Ex. 2 5-31.

As it was shown in the history of the criticism of the Pentateuch, the chief position at which literary criticism has arrived with regard to Genesis are these: (1) The oldest sources are J and E, closely parallel documents, both dating from the best period of Hebrew literature, but distinguished from each other by their use of the divine name, by slight idiosyncracies of style, and by quite perceptible differences of representation. (2) These sources were combined into a composite narrative JE by a redactor (R^{JE}). (3) The remaining source P (First Elohim) is a product of the Exilic or post-Exilic age, though it embodies older material. Originally an independent work, its formal and schematic character fitted it to be the framework of the Pentateuchal narrative; and this has determined the procedure of the final redactor (R^{JEP}), by whom excerpts from JE have been used to fill up the skeleton outline which P gave the primitive and patriarchal history.

B. Sources of Genesis Considered

Division of Genesis into sources according to Driver

The narrative of Genesis is cast into a framework, or scheme, marked by the recurring formula, (These are

the generations of ...). The phrase is strictly one proper to genealogies, implying that the person to whose name it is prefixed is of sufficient importance to mark a break in the genealogical series, and that he and his descendants will form the subject of the record which follows, until another name is reached prominent enough to form the commencement of a new section.¹

Thus Driver articulated the book of Genesis so he outlines it as follows:²

1. Chapter 1-4

Creation of heaven and earth 1:1-2:4a

Second account of the origin of man upon earth followed by the story of the Fall 2:4b-3:24

Growth of sin in the line of Cain, and progress of invention 4:1-24

Beginning of the line of Seth's descendants 4:25-26

2. 5:1-6:8

Adam and his descendants, through Seth, to Noah

Chapt. 5

The increasing wickedness of the earth 6:1-8

3. 6:9-9:29

History of Noah and his sons till their father's death, including, in particular, the narrative of the Flood 6:9-8:22

The covenant made by God with humanity in the person of Noah 9:1-17

¹S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. 6.

²Ibid., pp. 6-7.

4. 10:1-11:9

Sons of Noah and nations sprung from them Chapt. 10

The dispersion of mankind over the earth 11:1-9

5. 11:10-26

Line of Shem to Terah, the father of Abraham

6. 11:27-25:11

Terah, with the history of his descendants, Abraham
and Lot, ending with the death of Abraham.

7. 25:12-18

Ishmael, with list of Arab tribes claiming descendants for
him

8. 25:19-35:29

Life of Isaac, with history of Esau and Jacob, until
the time of Isaac's death

9. Chapter 36

Esau and his descendants, the rulers of the Edomites,
with a digression on the aboriginal inhabitants of Edom

10. Chapters 37-50

Life of Jacob subsequently to Isaac's death, and
history of his sons till the death of Joseph.

Driver divided the whole content of Genesis into three parts

(J.E.P.) as follows:¹

1. The beginning of History Chapt. 1-11.

1:1-2:4a, 2:4b-4:26, 5:1-28, 5:29, 5:30-32
P J P J P

6:1-8, 6:9-22, 7:1-5, 7:6, 7:7-10
J P J P J

¹Driver, op. cit., pp. 11-17

7:11, 7:12, 7:13-16a, 7:16b, 7:18-21,
P J P J P

7:22-23, 7:24-8:2a, 8:2b-3a, 8:3b-5, 8:6-12,
J P J P J

8:13a, 8:13b, 8:14-19, 8:20-22, 9:1-17, 9:18-27
P J P J P J

9:28-10:7, 10:8-19, 10:20, 10:21, 10:22-23, 10:24-30
P J P J P J

10:31-32, 11:1-3, 11:10-27, 11:28-30, 11:3-32,
P J P J P

2. Abraham and Isaac Chapt. 12-26

12:1-4a, 12:4b-5, 12:6-13:5, 13:6, 13:7-11a
J P J P J

13:11b-12a, 13:12b-18 Chapt. 14, 15:1-21,
P J Special Source E

16:1a, 16:1b-2, 16:3, 16:4-14, 16:15-16, 17:1-27
P J P J P E

18:1-19:28, 19:29, 19:30-38, Chapt. 20,
J P J E

21:1a, 21:1b, 21:2a, 21:2b-5, 21:6-32
J P J P E

21:33, 21:34-22:14, 22:15-18, 22:19, 22:20-24
J E J E J

23:1-20, 24:1-25:6, 25:7-11a, 25:11b
P J P J

25:12-17, 25:18, 25:19-20, 25:21-26a, 25:26b
P J P J P

25:27-26:33, 26:34-35
J P

3. Jacob and Esau Chapt. 27-36

27:1-45, 27:46-28:9, 28:10, 28:11-12, 28:13-16
J P J E J

28:17-18, 28:19, 28:20-29:1, 29:2-14, 29:15-23
E J E J E

29:24, 29:25-28, 29:29, 29:30, 29:31-35,
P E P E J
30:1-3a, 30:3b-5, 30:6, 30:7, 30:8, 30:9-16
E J E J E J
30:17-20a, 30:20b, 30:20c-22ba¹, 30:22bb¹, 30:23
E J E J E
30:24-31:1, 31:2, 31:3, 31:4-18a, 31:18b, 31:19-45,
J E J E P E
31:46, 31:47, 31:48-50, 31:51-32:2, 32:3-13a,
J E J E J
32:13b-21, 32:22, 31:23, 32:24-33:17, 33:18a,
E J E J P
33:18b-20, 34:1-2a, 34:2b-3, 34:4, 34:5, 34:6
E P J P J P
34:7, 34:8-10, 34:11-12, 34:13-18, 34:19
J P J P J
34:20-24,25 (Partly) 34:25 (Partly)-26, 34:27-29
P J P
34:30-31, 35:1-8, 35:9-13, 35:14, 35:16-20
J E P J E
35:21-22a, 35:22b-29, 36:1-37:2a
J P

4. Joseph Chapt. 37-50

37:2b-11, 37:12-18, 37:19-20, 37:21, 37:22-24
E J E J E
37:25-27, 37:28a, 37:28b, 37:28c-30, 37:31-35
J E J E J
37:36, 38:1-39:23, 40:1-45,
E J E
41:46, 41:47-42:37, 42:38-44:34, 45:1-46:5
P E J E
46:6-27, 46:28-47:4, 47:5-6a
P J P
47:6b, 47:7-11, 47:12, 47:13-27a
J P E J

47:27b-28, 47:29-31, 48:1-2, 48:3-7
 P J E P

48:8-22, 49:1a, 49:1b-28a, 49:28b-33,
 E P J P

50:1-11, 50:12-13, 50:14, 50:15-26
 J P J E

Robert H. Pfeiffer, in his book Introduction to the Old Testament, divided Genesis as follows:¹

1. The origin of the world and of the nations of mankind (Chapters 1-11).
 - a. The first account of creation (1:1-2:4P)
 - b. The second account: creation of Adam (2:5-7, S*), Planting of Eden (2:8-17, S), creation of Eve and animals (2:18-25, S)
 - c. The fall of Adam and Eve (3:1-24, S)
 - d. Cain and Lamech (4:1-24, S)
 - e. The descendants of Seth (4:25f, S; 5:1-32P)
 - f. The giants (6:1-4, S)
 - g. The Flood (6:5-9:17, S² and P)
 - h. The descendants of Noah (9:18-10:31 S, S², and P.)
 - i. The tower of Babel (11:1-9, S)
 - j. The ancestry of Abraham (11:10-32, redactional).
2. The Patriarchs (Chapters 12-50)
 - a. Abraham and Isaac (12:1-26:35)
 - (1) Abraham in Canaan and in Egypt (12:1-20 J P)

¹Pfeiffer, op. cit., pp. 132-133.

*Pfeiffer found a fourth sources in Genesis, namely S (South or Seir). This S source, thought Pfeiffer, was divided into two parts, S and S².

- (2) Abraham and Lot separate (13:1-18, J (P))
- (3) Abraham defeats the four kings of East (14:1-24, S and S²)
- (4) God's covenant with Abraham (15:1-21, E)
- (5) Hagar (16:1-16, J (P))
- (6) God's covenant with Abraham and the institution of circumcision (17:1-29, P)
- (7) Promise of a son to Sarah (18:1-15, J)
- (8) Lot and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (18:16-19:38 J and S)
- (9) Abraham at Gerar (20:1-17, E)
- (10) Birth of Isaac and expulsion of Hagar (21:1-34, J and E)
- (11) Sacrifice of Isaac (22:1-19, E)
- (12) The family of Nahor (22:20-24 redactional)
- (13) Death and burial of Sarah (23:1-20, P)
- (14) Isaac marries Rebekah (24:1-57, J)
- (15) Children of Keturah (25:1-6, redactional)
- (16) Death of Abraham (25:7-11, P)
- (17) Descendants of Ishmael (25:12-18, P)
- (18) Rebekah's children (25:19-34, J, E, and P)
- (19) Isaac at Gerar (26:1-35, J and E)
- b. Jacob (Chapt. 27:1-36:43)
 - (1) Jacob obtains the birthright and the blessing (27:1-4a, J-E; 27:4b-28:9, P)
 - (2) Jacob's dream at Bethel (28:10-22, E. (J))
 - (3) His marriage with Leah and Rachel (29:1-30:43, J (E,P))

- (4) Jacob's flight from Laban (31:1-55, J-E)
- (5) At Mahanaim and Peniel (32:1-32, J-E)
- (6) Reconciliation with Esau (33:1-20, J-E)
- (7) Simeon and Levi attack Shechem (34:1-31, S)
- (8) At Bethel and Hebron (35:1-29, E, P (S))
- (9) The descendants of Esau (36:1-19, 40-43, P; the
kings of Edom: 36:20-39, S)

c. Joseph and the other sons of Jacob (Chapt. 37:1-50:26)

- (1) Joseph's dreams and his coming to Egypt (37:1-36: J-E)
- (2) Judah and Tamar (38:1-30, S)
- (3) Potiphar's wife (39:1-23, J-E)
- (4) Joseph interprets dreams in prison (40:1-23, J-E)
- (5) Joseph interprets Pharaoh's dreams and becomes his
grand vizier (41:1-57, J-E)
- (6) Joseph's brothers in Egypt (42:1-45:28, J-E)
- (7) Jacob comes to Egypt (46:1-47:31, J-E, P)
- (8) Jacob blesses Manasseh and Ephraim (48:1-22, E and P)
- (9) The blessing of Jacob (49:1-27 ancient poem)
- (10) Death of Jacob and of Joseph (49:28-50:26 P (E))

The Reasons the Documentary Theory is Held

The main reasons why the critics hold the documentary theory
are as follows:

- 1. As has already been pointed out, in the history of Criticism, Astruc called attention to the fact that certain sections of Genesis use "Jehovah" while other sections use "Elohim" when speaking of God.

Exodus 6:3 says that God was not known to Abraham by the name "Jehovah," and that men previous to Moses' time did not know God by the name "Jehovah." As a matter of fact, according to the Book of Genesis, we find men, as in the days of Enoch, Gen. 4:26, beginning to call on the name of Jehovah. To account for this discrepancy, Astruc and his successors said that this showed that different documents were combined to make the Book of Genesis.¹

2. Doublets, or alleged duplicate passages such as Gen. 1:1-2:4a and 2:4b-25 contain a double narrative of the origin of man upon earth, and Gen. Chapt. 16 and 21 also a double account of Hagar's flight into the wilderness. There are also two stories of Abraham's difficulties with his wife, and still another similar story of Isaac.
3. Certain narrative discrepancies claim to be the marks of different writers. For example, there are two stories of the Flood woven together with differences in detail still showing through, such as the length of the Flood and the number of animals to be taken into the Ark. Three explanations for the name Isaac are recorded in Gen. 17:17, 18:12, and 21:6. There are two interwoven stories in the story of the selling of Joseph into Egypt one emphasizing the friendship of Judah and the other, Reuben; one calling his buyers "Midianites" and the other "Ishmaelites." These different accounts are thought to have come from different sources.
4. The language varies in different sections, and the peculiarities of style and grammar are noted and the documents divided accordingly.

¹ F. E. Hamilton, The Basis of Christian Faith (New York Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1946), p. 218.

5. One of the principal alleged grounds for dating the different documents late was that they were said to contain words which proved the document containing them to be late. A word, for example, which could be clearly shown to be of American origin, found in the Chinese document, would prove the document to be later than the 18th century for America never came in contact with China before the 18th Century. A document containing the word "phonograph" could not have been written before the phonograph was invented. It is claimed that there are similar words found in different books of the Old Testament which proved the books containing them to be late.¹

Probably the most important consideration of the documentary theorists is the belief that the Pentateuch shows signs of the presence of varying interests which developed over a period of years. When these interests are compared with books and events which can be definitely dated, it is believed that at least some of them must have developed long after the time of Moses. For example, at first there seemed to be no restriction upon the place where God could be worshipped, but later it was insisted that the worship be centralized at Jerusalem. For a long time we can detect an emphasis on morality as proclaimed by the earlier prophets. After the exile we can detect a great emphasis on the ritualistic side of religion as presented by the priests.

On the basis of these and similar considerations, the theory has been worked out that there was gradual development of religious ideas. The more complex the thought expressed, the later they were supposed to have developed. Particularly, the more priestly interest we find, the later were those parts in developing.²

The Three Documents in Genesis

According to scholars there are some differences about the sources in the book of Genesis, but the majority of them agreed that it contains three documents, J, E, and P.

1. The J (Jehovist) Document

"J" is the symbol given to that source which uses the name

¹Ibid., p. 219.

²S. A. Cartledge, A Conservative Introduction to the Old Testament (Athens, University of Georgia Press, 1944), p. 53.

of Jehovah (Jahweh) from the start. "It has a definite prophetic, rather than priestly emphasis."¹ The stories of "J" are told very graphically, and 'J' is the most picturesque and fascinating of all the sources--attractive alike for its fine poetic power and its profound religious insight."²

Skinner, about the characteristics of "J", says:

J presents on the whole, a more uniform literary texture than E. It is generally allowed to contain the best example of pure narrative style in the Old Testament; and in Genesis it rarely, if ever falls below the highest level. But while E hardly attains the same perfection of form, there are whole passages, especially in the more ample narratives, in which it is difficult to assign to the one a superiority over the other. J excels in picturesque "objectivity" of description,-- in the power to paint a scene with a few strokes, and in the delineation of life and character: his dialogues, in particular are inimitable "for the delicacy and truthfulness with which character and emotions find expression in them." (cf Gn. 44:18 (Driver, LOT, p. 119).)³

In J, God is frequently referred to in anthropomorphic terms.

Much more interest seems to be taken in places and events connected with the Southern Kingdom, so many feel that J came from Judah.

When did this source come into existence? There is some divergence in the dating as given by various scholars, but not very much:

¹Ibid., p. 219.

²J. E. McFadyen, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York, Hodder & Stoughton, n.d.), p. 14.

³J. Skinner, "Genesis," The International Critical Commentary (New York Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 39.

It is almost agreed among the critics that J and E come from about the same period, though the development of thought and morality of E seems to be somewhat higher and therefore later. J and E seem to have been in use by the time of Amos and Hosea but seem to have been later than the time of the division of the Kingdom. Most scholars would place the two sources at least between the limits of 900 and 750 B.C.¹

2. The E (Elohistic) Document. "E" was used for the prophetic sources which used the name Elohim for God before God revealed His name Jehovah to Moses in Exod. 3:15. E was not quite so pictorial in his descriptions as J. E avoided anthropomorphic conceptions of God: God communicated with men through visions and angels rather than directly "E seemed to be more worried when he recorded the sins of his character and tried to find some excuse for them: his ethical standards seem to have been somewhat higher than J's,"²

Skinner, as he compared the characteristics of E with J, said:

E frequently strikes a deeper view of subjective policy, especially of pathos, as in the account of Isaac's sacrifice (ch. 22), of the expulsion of Hagar (21:8), the dismay of Isaac and the tears of Esau on the discovery of Jacob's fraud (27:34), Jacob's lifelong grief for Rachel (48:7) or his tenderness towards Joseph's children (48:14). But no absolute distinction can be drawn, in the history of Joseph, e.g., the vein of pathos is perhaps more marked in J than in E. Where parallels are sufficiently distinct to show a tendency, it is found in several instances that J's objectivity of treatment has succeeded in preserving the archaic spirit of a legend which in E is transformed by the more refined sentiment of a later age.

¹Cartledge, op. cit., p. 57.

²Ibid., p. 56.

The best example of J's picture of Hagar, the intractable, indomitable Bedawi woman (Ch. 16), as contrasted with E's modernized version of the incident (21:8) with its affecting picture of the mother and child all but perishing in the desert. So again E (Ch. 20) introduces an extenuation of Abraham's falsehood about his wife which is absent from the older narrative of J (12:10).¹

When and where did the E document come from? As we already stated above, it was thought that E came a little later than J, as the development of morality of E was higher than J. Most of the critics agree that E came from the Northern Kingdom, or Ephraim, as J, from the Southern.

About the date and the author of E, Pfeiffer, without hesitation, said as follows:

About the middle of the eighth century, during the reign of Jeroboam II (785-744 B.C.), when the Northern Kingdom of Israel reached the apex of its power and prosperity before its end in 722, a Northern Israelite, presumably a priest of Bethel who may have heard Amos preach, composed an epic similar to the J document. It is called the Elohist (or E) document ... The priests of Bethel simply called their God Elohim, in the same way as the appellatives "the King, the President, the Major" are currently used for proper names, when no ambiguity is possible ... Like the J author, the writer of E document used the Canaanitic sanctuary legends and Israetic traditions circulating orally in North Israel, but omitted the Judean stories of Abraham at Hebron. Although the E author knew the J document, since he clearly corrected its outspoken objectivity and cross humor, he used the oral traditions as his source and has preserved it occasionally in a pure form.²

¹Skinner, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

²Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, pp. 49, 51.

3. The Priestly Code (P)

"P" was the priestly source. According to Pfeiffer, "the Priestly Code is a fifth-century commentary on the embryonic Pentateuch (J E D), including a series of narratives, often illustrating legal precedents, and a codification of ritual laws based on earlier codes."¹ In Genesis, P² embraced the description of the Creation of heaven and earth, and of God's rest upon the Sabbath (1:1-2⁴a); the line of Adam's descendants through Seth of Noah (5:1-28, 30-32); the story of the Flood, with the subsequent blessing of Noah, and covenant established with him by God (6:9-22, 7:6, 11, 13-16a 17a (except forty days) 18-21, 2⁴ 8:1-2a, 3b-5, 12a, 1⁴-19, 9:1-17, 28-29); an enumeration of nations descended from Japhet, Ham and Shem (10:1-7, 20, 22-23, 31-32); the line of Shem's descendants to Terah (11:10-26); a brief account of Abraham's family (11:27, 31-32), of his migration to Canaan, and separation there from Lot (12:4b-5, 13:6, 11b (from and they) -12a (to plain), of the birth of Ishmael (16:1a, 3, 15-16), the institution of Circumcision (Chapt. 17), the destruction of the cities of Plain (19:29), the birth of Isaac (21:1b, 2b-5), the purchase of the family burial-place at Machpelah in Hebron (Chapt. 23), the death of Abraham and his burial by his sons at Machpelah (25:7-11a); a list of tribes tracing their origin to Ishmael (25:12-17); Isaac's

¹Ibid., p. 57.

²Driver, op. cit., p.

marriage with Rebekah, Esau's Hittite wives, Jacob's journey to Paddan-Aram to obtain a wife agreeable to his mother's wishes (25:19-20, 26b, 26:34-35, 27:46-28:9), Jacob's marriage with Rachel, his return from Padden-Aram to Canaan (29:24-29, 31:18b (from and all) 33:18a), the refusal of sons to sanction intermarriage with the Shechemites (34:1-2a, 4, 6, 8-10, 13-18, 20-24, 25 (partly) 27-29), his change of name to Israel at Bethel (35:9-13, 15), the death of Isaac (35:22b-29); the history of Esau (Chapt. 36 (in the main)); the migration of Jacob and his family to Egypt, and their settlement by Pharaoh in the land of Rameses (37:1-2a (to Jacob) 41:46, 46:1-27, 47:5-6a, 7-11, 27b (from and they) 28), Jacob's adoption of Ephraim and Manasseh (48:3-6, 7), the final charge addressed by him to his sons, and his burial by them (49:1a, 28b-33, 50:12-13).

These passages present an outline of the antecedents and patriarchal history of Israel, in which only important occurrences--as the Creation, the Deluge, the ^Covenant with Noah and Abraham--are described with minuteness, but which is sufficient as an introduction to the systematic view of the theocratic institutions which was to follow in Exodus-Numbers. Therefore, the aim of the Priestly ^Code was to show how the only God in existence became the invisible sovereign of the Jewish community.

P had a very marked, formal style. It frequently repeated set phrases. There was nothing of the vivid

pictorial style of the prophetic sources. There was a great interest in matters of genealogy and Chronology. Ritualistic interests were very prominent. "P", like "E", used the name Elohim for God before Exod. 6:3. There were no anthropomorphisms in P, nor even any angels or visions; God simply spoke and His will is immediately done. There is a great interest in the origin of religious institutions and customs. God's covenant relationship to His people is emphasized."¹

As regards to the authors (many think P, sometimes J and E too, were not of individuals but of groups or schools), Pfeiffer said that

they were not only priests and lawyers, but scholars, the most erudite writers in the Old Testament. Their work is based on a careful examination of available literary sources. Whereas the J and E epics echoed the oral tradition of their people, the P authors searched with scholarly patience for written documents and looked with suspicion on information conveyed to them by word of mouth.²

P has been usually dated in Exilic or post-Exilic times. Many thought they saw the reflections of it in Ezekiel, Ezra and Nehemiah; sometime around 500 B.C. would not be far wrong.

How, then, these sources (J. E. P. and one other source, D) came together to make the present Pentateuch? There are some divergence among the critics in the details, but large measure of agreement to the major steps in the process. The two prophetic sources, J and E, were combined into one document,

¹Cartledge, op. cit., pp. 56-57.

²Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 67.

JE, probably not long after they originated independently.

The person or group that made the combination is referred to by the symbol R^{JE} (the JE redactor). Probably soon after 621, D was worked into the combined JE by the deuteronomic redactor, R^D , who not only put D in its proper place but also made notes of deuteronomistic nature from place to place in JE. Finally, the priestly redactor R^P , worked in the sources P into the combined JED, probably not long after the time of the origin of P.

C. Summary

The modern higher criticism of the book of Genesis began with Astruc, a French physician. Astruc, in 1753, called attention to the fact that in some sections of Genesis the name "Elohim" was used for God, while in other sections the name was "Jehovah." He thus assumed that the book of Genesis was the combination of two documents, later known as E and J.

Eichhorn, in 1778, pointed out the fact that certain characteristics of style could be traced in the portions which used the different Divine Names. De Wette distinguished a "Second Elohist" document which was later called P, the Priestly Code. De Wette, thus distinguished three main documents, P, E, and J., in the book of Genesis.

Through Graf and Wellhausen, the order of the periods of production of the documents was changed to J. E. P. from P. J. E.

J document, which is prophetic, was supposed to have been produced in Judea, the Southern Kingdom, while E document, which is also prophetic but avoided anthropomorphic conceptions of God, was supposed to be combined into the book of Genesis by "redactors."

Dr. Driver, Bacon, and Pfeiffer, the later scholars in this field, followed this theory and their position of viewpoint concerning the literary sources of Genesis are followed by most of the liberals today.

CHAPTER III

THE CONSERVATIVE VIEW CONCERNING
LITERARY SOURCES OF GENESIS

CHAPTER III

THE CONSERVATIVE VIEW CONCERNING LITERARY SOURCES OF GENESIS

A. The Origin of the Book of Genesis

Pure Revelation or Based on Any Sources?

Concerning the origin of the Pentateuch, the Conservatives accept the traditional view that it was a product of a single writer, Moses, except the account of Moses' death in the last eight verses or last chapter of Deuteronomy. Philo and Josephus even assumed that "Moses wrote the section concerning his death in the spirit of prophecy."¹ The extreme fundamentalists still follow this assertion but most conservatives do not. The well known contemporary conservative scholars, E. J. Young, M. F. Unger, W. H. Green and S. A. Cartledge all agree that Moses used pre-existing materials, oral or written, to write the Pentateuch by God's guidance. Allis in his book, The Five Books of Moses said:

Some have taken the tradition that "Moses wrote the Pentateuch" to mean that everything in it was given to Moses so directly by God that to raise the question of sources is unnecessary and even irreverent. This is not the case. It confuses the important difference between revelation and inspiration. As far as facts of history which were available to him are concerned, Moses did not need a special divine revelation. He needed only the guidance and illumination (inspiration) of the Holy Spirit to enable him to ascertain the facts and record them correctly. Moses doubtless knew the oral tradition current in his day and he may also have had access to written documents of great antiquity. We may well believe that he made such use of them as was appropriate and necessary. We have no reason to think that God made known to

¹P. Schaff, ed., Langie's Commentary on Genesis, (New York Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915) p. 94.

Moses by special revelation facts which he could readily ascertain by ordinary means.¹

About this matter Dr. Young said:

When we affirm that Moses wrote or that he was the author of the Pentateuch, we do not mean that he himself necessarily wrote every word . . . The witness of Sacred Scripture leads us to believe that Moses was the fundamental or real author of the Pentateuch. In composing it, he may indeed, as Astruc suggested, have employed parts of previously existing written documents. Also, under Divine inspiration, there may have been later minor additions and even revisions. Substantially and essentially, however, it is the product of Moses.²

Along this line Dr. Cartledge has same opinion:

Even if Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch, we must suppose that he used sources, oral and written probably, for much of the material, unless we hold to some mechanical dictation theory of inspiration.³

Now the background of the sources from which Genesis was originated is to be investigated.

Beginning the Practice of Writing Among the Hebrews

Although Genesis commences with the creation and the traditions of the most remote times, and the revelation of the Old Testament begins with the call of Abraham and the leading of the patriarchs, yet these times must not be expected to have any sufficient literature.

The discovery and first use of the art of writing was suggested by Dr. Keil as follows:

It is certainly at least as old as the time of Abraham: yet in the patriarchal age we meet with no absolutely certain traces of

¹O. T. Allis, The Five Books of Moses (Philadelphia, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1949), pp. 12-13.

²E. J. Young, An Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), p. 51.

³S. A. Cartledge, A Conservative Introduction to the Old Testament (Athens, University of Georgia Press, 1944), p. 59.

its employment by the Hebrews. But undoubtedly they made this art their own during their stay in Egypt: for here already we find Israelite officers who derived their name מִצְרַיִם from writing. All the more we may assume that Moses, the founder of theocracy brought up as he was in the Egyptian court, and instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Acts 7:22), not only was acquainted with it, but was so practised in it that he could set down in writing the laws which were given to his people, and so ensure them against that disfiguration which is unavoidable in the case of mere oral tradition. Nay, in the time of Moses the art of writing is presupposed, and mentioned as being already well known and in common use among the people.¹

The Sources Moses Used

Writers as early as Vitringa, Richard Simon, Clerius, and others were of the opinion that Genesis was founded on written sources.² However it is unknown how much of the historical accounts from remote antiquity and from the age of the patriarchs was handed down by word of mouth, and how much had been written down earlier than the time of Moses.

Dr. J. H. Raven suggested that some of the written materials might have been handed down from Abraham. He said:

Abraham came from a country where the knowledge of writing and reading was common and from an important city mentioned in the code of Hammurabi, probably the Amraphel of Genesis 14. In that country traditions of the creation and the flood were preserved, which have much in common with those in Genesis. That is the very country also in which Genesis places the site of the Garden of Eden and where the confusion of tongues is said to have occurred. There, if anywhere, the remains of an original revelation concerning the creation and an accurate story of the flood would be handed down. What could be more natural than that Abraham carried such records and genealogies with him from the banks of Euphrates to the land of Canaan? "Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac" (Gen. 25:5). Perhaps these priceless records were among his possessions. If

¹K. F. Keil, Historio - Critical Introduction to the Old Testament (Edinburg, T. & T. Clark, 38, George Street, 1892), p. 15.

²J. McClintock, ed., Biblical Theological and Ecclesiastical Cyclopaedia (New York, Harper & Brothers, Publishers) III, p. 778.

so, they went down with Jacob into Egypt and form the basis of Genesis 1-11 as written by Moses.¹

It was also Dr. Raven's opinion that since more than three-quarters of Genesis (chapters 12-50) referred to events in the life-time of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Moses might have been inspired to collect the materials by his evident interest in his family. Moses' powerful position in Egypt would have made it easy. The personal tone of record of Abraham's prayer for Sodom and of his offering Isaac as well as that of Joseph's making himself known to his brethren was just what many expect if the record of Moses were based upon an earlier autobiographical record.²

He also thought that in one matter, at least, tradition was handed down from Joseph to Moses through the four centuries of the sojourn in Egypt:

Joseph made his brothers promise to carry up his bones from Egypt (Gen. 50:25). Joseph's body was kept carefully until Moses' time, was carried out of Egypt by the Israelites (Ex. 13:19) and buried at Shechem (Josh. 24:32). Coffins of Joseph's time and earlier were inscribed with extracts from the Egyptian Book of the Dead. But if the coffins of Egyptian priests and princes bore inscriptions from Egyptian holy books, why should not the coffin of Joseph, the savior of Israel and the Premier of Egypt, bear records of the traditions of his ancestors? Such a plausible suggestion shows how easily reliable sources for Genesis could have come into the hands of Moses.³

Recently, as a result of archaeological discovery, many conservative scholars have been convinced of the historical trustworthiness of the book

¹J. H. Raven, Old Testament Introduction General and Special (New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1959), pp. 131-132.

²Ibid., p. 131.

³Ibid., p. 132.

of Genesis, and the fact that there were many written materials which might have been available for Moses to use in his writing of Genesis. Dr. Donald T. Wiseman's research, Archaeological Confirmation of the Old Testament is quite valuable for the students of the Old Testament. The statement is as follows in summary.¹ Sumerian and Akkadian (Babylonian and Assyrian) epics were compared with the early narratives of Genesis. Their story of the origin of the universe and man was similar to the Genesis account, though the differences between it and the Biblical record were too numerous for the latter to have evolved from the Mesopotamian epics. There was record of a great flood in the Babylonian literature. The epics of Gilgamesh resemble Genesis 6-9, however, most of the text is different. A fragment of the Gilgamesh dated to the second Millennium B. C. has recently been found at Megiddo. It combined with such traditions as that of the Tower of Babel which may well refer to the ziggurat of Babylon at sometime when that city flourished between the third millennium and its destruction about 1600 B.C. Also, recently Sumerian texts which have earlier parallels with the Hebrew stories have been published. One of these epics possibly describes the state of life in paradise which was naturally irrigated (Gen. 2:6). Also, child birth was without pain and a curse followed the eating of a plant. There is also the description of a woman named Nin-ti, a Sumerian word which means "the lady of the rib" and "the lady who makes alive." This sounds like the Bible account of Eve, who was made from the rib of Adam.

¹C. F. H. Henry, ed., Revelation and the Bible (Grand Rapids, Michigan, Baker Book House, 1958), pp. 302-309.

Many inscriptions which remind the readers about the Patriarchal history in the Bible have been found. The discovery of more than seventy thousand inscribed clay tables in Syria (eighteenth to seventeenth centuries, B. C.) from ancient Alalakh and Mari have brought a revolution of thoughts about the historicity of patriarchal period. Many parallels between the predominantly Hurrian (Horite) tablets of Nuzi have been described by Gordon and Speiser. Thus the tablets help explain the relation of Eliezer and Abraham, as adoptee to a childless couple who yielded his right to be real heir (Gen. 15:2-4), likewise the action of Sarah in providing Hagar for her husband. The possession of household gods (teraphim) constituted the right of becoming chief inheritor in the family (Gen. 31:19, 30-35). The labor of Jacob for his bride was a common practice among the Aramean tribes. Oral blessing having legal force, and levirate marriage, the right of a daughter to inherit property, and a form of sale adoption (cf. Exod. 21:7-11) are other customs found at that time.

Both the Old Testament and these documents imply that the mixed population in Palestine included Hittites, whose early entrance into Palestine is shown by the Alalakh texts. The Hittite laws were applicable to the negotiations by Abraham for the cave of Machpelah (Gen. 23).

This increase in the knowledge of the patriarchal age from the text, combined with the archaeological evidence, has led scholars of many shades of religious opinion to affirm the historical nature of the patriarchal narratives.

B. Literary Analysis

As already stated in the preceding chapter, the main reason why the liberals held the J. E. P. documentary theory was based on the literary difficulties of the book of Genesis, such as: (1) the variation to the use of the Divine Name, (2) the occurrence of alleged parallel passages, and (3) alleged differences in vocabulary and style.

How, then, do the conservatives explain about these problems in the book of Genesis? Their explanations are as follows:

The Variations in the Divine Names

About the use of the divine names in Genesis, Dr. Allis' research is as follows:

...That Elohim occurs 33 times in the first 34 verses of Genesis and is followed by Jehovah Elohim 20 times in the next 45 verses and then by Jehovah 10 times in the 25 verses which follow is a remarkable fact.....

Such marked variation in the use of the divine names as occurs in the opening chapters of Genesis is rare. The divine names do not occur sufficiently frequently in the book of Genesis to form the basis of detailed analysis of the entire book. There are four chapters in which the Deity is not mentioned (Chaps. XXXIV., XXXVI., XXXVII., XLVII.). In the last twenty chapters the name Jehovah occurs only 15 times, 11 of which are found in two chapters. (Three in Chap. XXXVIII., and eight in Chap. XXXIX.) Yet J passages or traces of J are found in all of the twenty. Elohim does not occur in 15 chapters (Chps. X-XVI., XVIII., XXIX., XXIV., XXXVI.-XXXVIII., XLVII., XLIX.), and only once in each of 7 others (Chaps. iv., xxiii., xxv., xxix., xi., xlii.). Yet one of these chapters (xxiii.) is assigned as a whole to P and portions of twelve of the others. In the last 30 chapters of Genesis, Elohim occurs 85 times, of which only 10 (or 11) are assigned to P. Of these, half occur in a single passage (xxxv. 9-13, 15), the others being xxi. 2b, 4, xxiii. 6, xxv. 11a, and xxviii. 4. Obviously then, any detailed analysis must be based largely on other data than the variation in the use of the divine name.¹

¹O. T. Allis, The Five Books of Moses, pp. 23-24.

Concerning the name Jehovah Elohim combined together, Dr. Allis said:

Even more remarkable than the alternation between Elohim and Jehovah in these opening chapters is the fact already alluded to, that these two names are joined together 20 times in Chapters ii. and iii. (The LXX varies considerably from the Hebrew in its rendering of the divine names in these chapters. But the consistent usage of the Massoretic Text favors its originality.) This is especially significant because the combination Jehovah Elohim is quite rare, occurring elsewhere in the Pentateuch only once (Ex. ix. 30) and less than 20 times in all the rest of the Old Testament. This favors the view that there must be a special reason for the use of this compound name here and there it is identified Elohim as God of creation with Jehovah as God of redemption. It is also significant that, while Jehovah Elohim occurs 20 times in Chaps. ii. 4-iii. 24, Elohim is used 4 times in the conversation between the serpent and the women (iii. 1-5). This fact favors the view that these names are sometimes used significantly. The name Jehovah would be quite inappropriate¹ in the mouth of the serpent, the enemy and seducer of mankind.

It is a common opinion among the conservatives that Moses used these two names, Jehovah and Elohim, purposely to distinguish one from the other according to their significance of meaning. Dr. Green made the significance of the divine names clear as follows:

As Jehovah is the name appropriate to the Most High as the God of revelation and of redemption, there is a manifest propriety in its employment, as in actual fact it is predominantly employed at just these signal epochs in which this aspect of his being is most conspicuously exhibited. It requires no assumption of a Jehovist writer to account for what thus follows from the nature of the case. That Jehovah should fall more into the background in the intervals between these signal periods of self-revelation is also what might be expected. Yet it does not disappear entirely. It recurs with sufficient frequency to remind the reader of the continuity of that divine purpose of salvation, which is never abandoned, and is never entirely merged in mere general providential control.

As Elohim is the term by which God is denoted in his relation to the word at large, in distinction from his special relation to his own people, it is a matter of course that the creation

¹Ibid., p. 24.

of heaven and earth and all that they contain is ascribed to him as Elohim (Gen. i). It is equally natural that when the world, which he had made very good, had become so corrupt as to frustrate the end of its creation, the Creator, Elohim, should interfere to arrest this degeneracy by a flood, and should at the same time devise measures to preserve the various species of living things in order to replenish the earth once more (vi. 11-ix. 17). Here, too, was a case for Jehovah's interference likewise to preserve his plan of grace and salvation from utter failure by sweeping away the corrupt mass and preserving pious Noah and his family from its contamination and its ruin. Hence, while in the description of this catastrophe Elohim predominates, Jehovah is introduced whenever this special feature is particularly alluded to (vi. 1-8; vii. 1-5, 16b; viii. 20-22). And Jehovah interferes again to avert the new peril involved in the impious attempt at Babel (xi. 1-9); and he is not unobservant of the ambitious designs of the kingdom erected there (x. 8-10).¹

Dr. Green continued this argument throughout the history of the patriarchs in Genesis and defined Jehovah as revealing Himself to the Israelites in redemptive characteristics while Elohim is a general word for Deity recognized by the Gentiles.²

Along this line, Floyd E. Hamilton's dialectic argument against Astruc's clue is worthwhile to quote here.

But let us consider the "Clue" itself. A well-attested reading of Exodus vi:3 has "I was not made known" in place of "I was not known." In this case the meaning would be that God did not reveal His redemptive attributes signified by the name "Jehovah," to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but revealed Himself as a God power only. This would not mean that His name, but that His nature as a God of redemption was not known. ...the word Elohim was a general name for the idea of a God, while each people had a particular name for their god. Thus Jehovah had revealed Himself to the Israelites as the God of the whole earth and had told them that His proper title was "Jehovah." However, when Israelites were speaking to people of other races, as such people would not know about whom they were talking if they used the word Jehovah, they had to use

¹W. H. Green, The Unity of the Book of Genesis (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), pp. 543-544.

²Ibid., pp. 544-548.

the word Elohim or its equivalent in the language in which they were speaking in order to make them understand. Thus Joseph, when he spoke to Potiphar's wife said: "How shall I sin against Elohim?" for she would not have known the word Jehovah, the particular name of God known to the Hebrews. The other verses in the chapter say that Jehovah was with Joseph, again using the word in a natural sense. If this point is remembered, there will be no difficulty whatever about the uses of the words Elohim and Jehovah in their proper places in the Pentateuch, and the fact that some passages used Jehovah and others used Elohim would not be any indication that the book made use of two documents in such places, but simply that each name was used in its proper circumstances. We thus see that it is easily possible to reconcile this verse in Exodus VI:3 with the facts as found in the Book of Genesis, and that as a clue for separating the different documents, it is a failure.¹

The Alleged Parallel Passages

The critics maintain that the book of Genesis contains duplicate accounts of the same events and their so-called doublets are due to separate accounts taken from different documents. Concerning this theory Hamilton said:

At first sight these may seem to indicate separate documents, but when we examine passages said to be examples of these duplicate passages, we find that they prove nothing of the kind. For example Genesis I is an account of the creation of the universe, while Genesis II is an account of the creation of man and his surroundings, not in any sense a parallel account. The account of Hagar's flight into the wilderness in Genesis XVI, proves to be entirely different from the similar account in Genesis XXI....Repeating for emphasis is a common literary practice, while nothing is commoner in literature than giving summaries before going on with an account.... At any rate they do not indicate separate documents, late dates or that the documents which contain them are forgeries.²

¹F. E. Hamilton, The Basis of Christian Faith (New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1946), pp. 222-223.

²Ibid., pp. 227-228.

Dr. Unger's explanation of this problem more clearly shows what the conservatives believe about the doublets in the Genesis narrative. First of all, he thinks that many of the alleged parallel passages refer to distinct events merely containing similar features. For instance, the two narratives of Hagar's expulsion (Gen. 16:4-16, for the liberals this attributes to J and P, and Gen. 21:9-21, to E) are two entirely distinct episodes taking place at different times, the first just before Ishmael was born, the second when he was a lad at least fifteen years of age.¹ About the two accounts of the alliance of Abraham (Gen. 21:22-34) and Isaac (Gen. 26:26-33) with Abimelech, king of Gerar, Dr. Unger said:

But nothing could be more natural than that a son should renew a covenant, which his father had found advantageous. In closer connection with this alleged duplicate account critics list another "doublet"--the two namings of Beersheba, by Abraham (Genesis 21:31) and by Isaac (26:33). The simple explanation is that this is not a doublet at all. Isaac reopened the wells which Abraham had dug and which the Philistines meanwhile had filled up. While Isaac was at Beersheba, Abimelech came and made a covenant with him, as he or his predecessor had done with Abraham. That same day, Isaac's servant announced that they had reached water. As in former like cases, Isaac piously revived the old name, calling the well Shibah...thus confirming and preserving the name Beersheba.²

Secondly, Dr. Unger suggests that the other alleged parallel passages do refer to the same events but under a different aspect and for a different purpose. For example, Genesis 1:1-2:4a (assigned to P) and 2:4b-25 (allotted to J) are not duplicate or parallel accounts of creation but one is a sequel or supplement of the other.

¹M. F. Unger, Introductory Guide to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 1956), pp. 253.

²Ibid., p. 254.

The first account catalogues the creation of the heavens and the earth (Gen. 1:1). Man is included only as one of the features necessary to complete the picture. The second is not another account of the creation of the heavens and the earth. It, as the introductory key phrase (2:4) indicates, is a record of the generations of the heavens and of the earth. That is the creation of man whose body, as verse 7 indicates, was "formed of dust of the ground (earth)" and whose soul was of heavenly origin, since it is specially said, "the Lord God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" The term "generations" (plural) applies specially to the creation of woman (2:21-25) and the generations of their immediate descendants (3:1-4:26).¹

In regard to the story of the Flood, Dr. Allis demonstrated the unity of the narrative by showing that the repetition and elaboration were not the result of a fusion of different sources but a literary device common in Biblical style to stress the three main emphases in the account, namely, the sinfulness of man as the cause of the Flood, the destruction of all flesh as the aim of the Flood, and the saving of a righteous remnant as the result of the Flood.²

Vocabulary and Style

It is the higher critics' opinion that the alleged differences in the vocabulary and style in the Pentateuch indicate the late date of the documents and the composite character of the books.

¹Ibid., p. 255.

²Allis, op. cit., pp. 97-101.

To this Dr. Unger repulsed them, as he said that Alleged differences in vocabulary in the Pentateuch constitute an inconclusive argument against its Mosaic integrity.

The Mosaic authenticity with all of its problems offers an explanation of the linguistic phenomena of the Pentateuch unencumbered by the difficulties and absurdities of the critical hypothesis, which frequently necessitates the most violent vivisection of Biblical passages to harmonize the text with its often ridiculous preconceptions.

The existence of Aramaism in various parts of the Pentateuch is, moreover, no decisive argument against Mosaic authenticity, A close relationship between Hebrews and Arameans from patriarchal times (Genesis 31:47; Judges 3:8ff., I Samuel 14:47; II Samuel 8:3ff., etc.) offers sufficient explanation.¹

Concerning the literary style of the book of Genesis, Hamilton's discussion is as follows:

Now in the first place, no one denies that Moses used various source documents in the preparation of the Book of Genesis. Indeed there is every probability that this history was handed down in written clay tablets carried by Abraham from Babylonia, and transmitted to his descendants down to the time of Moses. Now if he did use sources, we have no way of showing that he did not take over some of the characteristics of the style as well. Perhaps he merely combined different sections from the sources into the running narrative of Genesis and corrected the errors if there were any in the sources. In that case the style would be taken over too. This did not militate in any way against the Mosaic authorship of the book, any more than a similar use of sources indicates that modern historians did not write the works attributed to them. The Holy Spirit so guided him that he did not include error in his complete document.²

C. Summary

As has been seen through this chapter, the conservative view of literary sources of Genesis may be summed up as follows:

¹Unger, op. cit., p. 260.

²Hamilton, op. cit., pp. 235-236.

- (1) The origin of the book of Genesis is from a single writer, Moses, who used pre-existing oral or written source materials which were handed down to him. The documentary theory is denied.
- (2) Moses, using these sources, wrote Genesis by the inspiration of God.
- (3) The literary problems such as the variations in the Divine name, the parallel passages and alleged differences in the vocabulary and style in the book of Genesis do not break the Mosaic integrity of the book.

CHAPTER IV

THE LIBERAL VIEW

CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP OF GENESIS

CHAPTER IV

THE LIBERAL VIEW CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP OF GENESIS

As far as the problem of the authorship is concerned, the book of Genesis could not be isolated from the other books of the Pentateuch. Both the liberals and the conservatives regard the book of Genesis as the first book of the Pentateuch. In the procedure of this research consequently, it is natural to deal with the whole Pentateuch from time to time, however, the writer tried to concentrate on Genesis only.

A. The Early Exponents' View

Concerning the authorship of the Book of Genesis, Jean Astruc, the beginner of the modern Pentateuchal criticism, did not deny the Mosaic authorship of Genesis. He merely thought that "Moses had used previously existing documents and that the divine names furnished the clue for identifying documents."¹ Astruc thought, in Genesis, there were two principal sources, A (using Elohim) and B (employing Jehovah). Besides these two main documents, Astruc alleged that there were ten other sources of lesser content (C to M). For Astruc, these documents were employed by Moses to compile the book of Genesis.

Astruc's view was essentially the position of Eichhorn and Ilgen. Johann Eichhorn extended the Astruc's documentary theory to the entire

¹E. J. Young, An Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids Michigan, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), p. 124.

Pentateuch. In his book Introduction to the Old Testament, in the first three editions, he defended the Mosaic authorship, but in the fourth edition, he abandoned it asserting "the Pentateuch was a compilation of Mosaic and other documents edited at a later period."¹ Karl Ilgen, Eichhorn's successor, "dissected Genesis into seventeen different documents assigned to three authors, the Jehovist and the two Elohist (subsequently called P and E)."²

B. Later Trends

Alexander Geddes, the advocate of the Fragmentary Hypothesis, asserted that the Pentateuch, in its present form, was not the work of Moses, but was probably compiled during the reign of Solomon in Jerusalem. He further united the book of Joshua to the Pentateuch. Thus, Geddes anticipated the modern view of a Hexateuch, rather than the Pentateuch.

Geddes' view was developed by Johann Vater. Vater split the Pentateuch into thirty-nine fragments, dating some from the Mosaic age, a large part of Deuteronomy from the David-Solomonic era and the other portion from other periods. He put the compilation of these heterogeneous fragments at the time of the exile.

William De Wette contended that the many fragments were pieced together by different compilers. He, in his treatment of Genesis, had maintained that "the author had before him a document

¹M. F. Unger, Introductory Guide to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 1956), p. 243.

²Unger, loc. cit.

(E) which was supplemented with bits from other sources."¹

De Wette also thought that there had been a three-fold redaction of the Hexateuch, the Elohist, the Jehovist and the Deuteronomic. The Jehovist had supplemented the Elohist document, a work of the time of Jeroboam I.²

Oswald expressed the opinion that the basis of the first six books of the Bible lay on Elohist writing in which the author had used older sections, such as the Ten Commandments. Later, a parallel writing arose and this employed the name Jehovah. A later hand took excerpts from this J document and inserted them into the basic document E, and at times his work is visible.³

Bleek thought that the redactor who supplemented the Elohist source was the Jehovist himself.

However, Bleek also thought that many passages in the Pentateuch were originally Mosaic, and that with these books we are standing on historical ground. Deuteronomy differs from the previous books in that it is not a collection, but a unit, and related to Jeremiah. There were, according to Bleek, two principal redactors of the whole Pentateuch. One occurred during the period of the yet undivided monarchy, and was made by the compiler of Genesis. The second was made by the compiler of Deuteronomy, sometime near the end of the Judean state, and this also included Joshua. The whole work, thus redacted, was discovered in the 18th year of the reign of Josiah.⁴

Hupfeld's theory was adopted by Edward Boehmer, Eberhard Schrader, Theodor Nealdecke, August Dillman, Franz Delitzsch, Rudolf Kittel, W. W. Baudissin and others, and forms the basis of the modern theory.

¹Young, op. cit., p. 129.

²Ibid., p. 130.

³Ibid., p. 129.

⁴Ibid., pp. 129-130.

C. Modern View

As early as 1834 Edward Reuss had maintained that the basic Elohist document (P) was the latest of all the Pentateuchal documents and was elaborated by Ezekiel and the priestly school during the Babylonian exile, being inserted in the other documents to form the Pentateuch. Final redaction was made at the time of Ezra (445 B.C.).¹

Karl H. Graf, a pupil of Reuss, undertook to give a scientific exposition of his professor's opinion in his critical researches on the historical books of the Old Testament. Graf thought that "Deuteronomy was Josianic, and shows acquaintance with the Jehovist and Elohist but not with the Priestly Code."²

Through Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen the Grafian theory has become the most prevailing theory among the modern liberal scholars.

Kuenen and Wellhausen considered the prophetic, so-called JE, to be the older of the main sources of the Hexateuch. JE itself is composite, a close amalgamation of two kindred narratives of Hebrew history. Benjamin W. Bacon, in his book, The Genesis of Genesis, favored to the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen view as follows:

J (circ. 800) and E (circ. 750) circulated for a time independently, and were more or less modified. After the destruction of Ephraim and the discovery of Deuteronomy (621) whose origin also must be placed at about this period (650-621), J and E were united into a closely welded whole, and soon after, Deuteronomy, which had, meantime, received an introduction and an appendix, was incorporated.

¹Unger, op. cit., p. 246.

²Unger, loc. cit.

These two processes necessitated further interpolation and modification, and for a considerable period $\frac{(J + E) + D}{Rje} = JED$

circulated as a well-rounded "prophetic" composition. But with the interruption of the cultus by the exile began the process of codification of the Levitical, ritual law. Heretofore it has been consuetudinary, tradition and living praxis having sufficed for its transmission. Ezekiel inaugurated the new system of a written Torah, which progressed during the exile with the formation of the code known as the Heiligkeitstgesetz, P¹ (Lev. 17-26), an antique body of laws midway in tone between Deuteronomy and the priestly legislation. It culminated in the priestly code P². This great work drew from JE a sketch of the history, made from its own stand-point. It was subsequently enlarged by the incorporation of P¹ and by expansion and addition designated P³. Ezra introduced it as the constitution of the post-exilic hierarchical state. A final redactor, R, combined P with JED at some time between Ezra's promulgation thereof (444 B.C.). We might express the process by the formula:

$$\text{Hexateuch} = \frac{(J + E) + D + (P^1 + P^2 + P^3)}{Rje \quad Rd \quad R} \quad 1$$

As it has been shown above, it is the liberals' opinion that the book of Genesis, in the present form, was attributed to the works of compilers or redactors.

J, supposed to come from Judah about 800 B.C. and E, supposed to come from the Northern Kingdom about 750 B.C. were combined by the first compiler, then second compiler combined P, supposed to be a product of the times of Exilic or post-Exilic, to JE, thus Genesis came into being as present form.

$$\text{Genesis} = \frac{(J + E) + P}{RJE \quad R \text{ (or RJE P)}} \\ \text{(First Compiler) (Second Compiler)}$$

As to the process by which the book of Genesis assumed its present form, Dr. Driver's explanation is quite interesting and worthwhile to quote here:

¹B. W. Bacon, The Genesis of Genesis (London, The Student Publishing Co., 1893), pp. 65-66.

First, the two independent, but parallel, narratives of the patriarchal age, 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, has been sufficiently illustrated. 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. Thus he naturally assigned 1:1-2:3 the first place,--perhaps at the same time removing 2:4a from its original position as superscription to 1:1 and placing it where it now stands. In appending next, from J, the narrative of Paradise, he omitted probably the opening words (for the narrative begins abruptly), and to Jahweh added the defining adjunct Elohim "God," for the purpose of identifying expressly the Author of life in 2:4bff. with God, the Creator, in 1:1ff. Still following J, he took from it the history of Cain and his descendants (4:1-24), but rejected the list of Seth's descendants (which the fragments that remain show that J must have once contained) except the first two names (4:25f.), and the etymology of Noah (5:29), in favor of the genealogy and chronological details of P (5:1-28, 30:32). In 6:1-9:17 he combines into one the double narrative of the Flood, preserving, however, more from both narratives than was usually his practice, and in parts slightly modifying the phraseology. In 9:18-27 he introduces from J the prophetic glance at the character and capabilities of the three great ethnic groups descended from Noah, following it by the account, from P, of the close of Noah's life (9:28f). C. 10 (the Table of nations) includes elements derived from both sources; it is succeeded by the account from J of the dispersion of mankind (11:1-9). C. 11:10-25 carries on the line of Israel's ancestors from Shem to Terah, from P; 11:26-32 states particulars respecting Abram's immediate relations, taken partly from P, partly from J, and necessary as an introduction to the history of Abram in C. 12ff. Mutatis mutandis, a similar method is followed in the rest of the book. The narrative of Genesis, though composite, is constructed upon a definite plan, and to the development of this plan the details that are incorporated from the different sources employed are throughout subservient.¹

Before this chapter comes to the end, it is a question, where was the liberal view already studied derived from? The reasons

¹S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (New York Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), pp. 20-21.

derived from the critics' scientific literary analysis of the book of Genesis in the method of their study were already seen in Chapter II and III of this thesis and will be shown in Chapter VI. The answer for this question, therefore, is omitted here.

D. Summary

The liberal view concerning the authorship of Genesis is summarized as follows:

1. The early opponents did not deny the Mosaic authorship of Genesis though they founded the documentary theory according to the use of Divine Names in Genesis.
2. Later critical scholars split Genesis into three main sources, J, E and P, and many other minor sources. These were supposed to be pieced together by different compilers.
3. The modern liberals favor the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen theory that J, which is the product of Judah about 800 B.C. and E, which is from the Northern Kingdom about 750 B. C. were combined by the first redactor (R^{JE}). P, which is supposed to be a product during the times of Exilic or post-Exilic was finally combined with JE by the second redactor (R or R^{JEP}) thus the book of Genesis came into being in the present form.

CHAPTER V

THE CONSERVATIVE VIEW CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP OF GENESIS

CHAPTER

THE CONSERVATIVE VIEW CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP OF GENESIS

The book of Genesis itself is anonymous. The title "The First Book of Moses, called Genesis" is not a part of the original book. It can be considered only as evidence of an ancient tradition. Although Moses appears on nearly every page of the last four books of the Pentateuch, he is not mentioned at all in the book of Genesis. The question of the authorship of Genesis, therefore, cannot properly be discussed apart from the general question of the authorship of the entire Pentateuch. Especially this is true for the conservatives.

Though there is no superscription or introduction or express claim that the work in its entirety is from Moses, the traditional view, which the conservatives unanimously follow, is that the first five books of the Bible were written by one man and that man was Moses.

This position was universally held by the ancient Jewish synagogue, the inspired New Testament writers, the Early Christian Church and by virtually all commentators, both Jewish and Christian until challenged by modern higher criticism.¹

Josephus, the Jewish historian, in speaking of the sacred books of the Jews declares: "and of them, five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death" (Against Apion, 1, 8.). That these words refer to the Pentateuch, that they attribute it to Moses and that they represent the accepted opinion of Jewish scholars of the past is undeniable. The acceptance of this belief in

M. F. Unger, Introductory Guide to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 1956), p. 213.

the Christian Church is shown by the fact that in Luther's translation of the Bible each of the books of the Pentateuch is entitled a "Book of Moses," and that a similar statement appears in the 1611 Version of the English Bible.¹

The question whether a tradition which is so ancient and so universal is correct is not only important in itself, but demands and merits the most careful scrutiny.

A. The Basis of the Mosaic Tradition

The basis of the Mosaic tradition, the conservatives explain, is four-fold: namely, (1) its witness to itself, (2) witness of the rest of the Old Testament, (3) witness of the New Testament, and (4) the voice of tradition.

The Witness of the Pentateuch Itself

Dr. Unger said:

Pentateuchal texts directly assert that Moses wrote at least parts of the Pentateuch. A careful study of the context and scope of these passages clearly implies that these portions are considerable. While there is no warrant to conclude from this direct evidence alone that Moses wrote all the Pentateuch, neither is there reason to deny Mosaic authorship of all other parts for which such authorship is not specifically predicted, as modern critics do, or to relegate the verses, in which Mosaic authorship is specifically asserted, to later redactors. Such a procedure is highly arbitrary, lacking objective foundation.²

The following six passages are considered by the conservatives to be valuable to testify that Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

1. Exodus 17:14 "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in the book, and rehearse it in the ears

¹O. T. Allis, The Five Books of Moses (Philadelphia, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1949), p. 5.

²Unger, op. cit., pp. 215-216.

of Joshua: for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven."

2. Exodus 24:4-8 "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord" (verse 4a). This refers at least to the "book of the covenant" (Ex. 21:2-23:33), and may even include chapters 19 and 20.
3. Exodus 34:27 "And the Lord said unto Moses, write these words, for in accordance with these words have I made a covenant with thee and with Israel." This is the second command of the Lord unto Moses to write. It refers to Ex. 34:10-26, the second decalogue.
4. Numbers 33:1, 2 "And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journey by the commandment of the Lord" (verse 2a).
5. Deuteronomy 31:9 "And Moses wrote this law and gave it unto the priests and the sons of the Levi who bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel." Verse 24 "And it came to pass when Moses had finished writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished."
6. Deuteronomy 31:22 "And Moses wrote this song in that day, and he taught it to the children of Israel." The reference is to Deuteronomy 32.

Concerning Exodus 17:14 Dr. Young said:

This verse shows that Moses was regarded as the proper person for writing. What he was to write probably includes the prophecy and its historical occasion, the attack of Amalek. The article "the book," should probably not be stressed, although it possibly implies the existence of a definite book.¹

Also Dr. Young commented concerning Numbers 33:1, 2 as follows:

Here it is expressly stated that Moses wrote the list of stations from Egypt to Moab, covering the entire journey of the children of Israel. This itinerary is in reality a strong argument for the Mosaic authorship of the entire Pentateuchal narrative. If Moses wrote this itinerary, he doubtless wrote the surrounding narrative of the wilderness wanderings.²

¹E. J. Young, An Introduction to the Old Testament, (Grand Rapids, Michigan, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954) p. 48.

²Ibid., p. 49.

With regard to the book of Genesis, Dr. Allis stressed its author to be Moses.

We are also told that Moses gave as a parting legacy to Israel the Song and the Blessing recorded in Deut. xxxii-xxxiii. The fact that these chapters are expressly attributed to Moses favors the correctness of Josephus' phrase "and the tradition of the origin of mankind till his death" (That Josephus regarded Moses as the author of Genesis is shown by this sentence which follows the one just quoted: "This interval of time was little short of three thousand years" (Against Apion I.6)). They show that Moses was interested in the past history of his people (xxxii. 7, 8); and the author of Deut. xxxiii might well be the recorder of Gen. xlix. The use of the divine name, "Most High" (xxxiii. 8) is reminiscent of Gen. xiv. (of Num. xxiv. 16), just as "Rock" (xxxii. 4, 13, etc.) is connected with Ex. vii. (cf. Gen. xlix. 24, "the stone of Israel"). The word "Separate" (id.) suggests Gen. x. 5, 32 (P) and xxv. 23 (J). The reference to Sodom and Gomorrah (xxxii. 32) recalls Gen. xviii-xix. (J). The remark of the Jewish commentator Rashi on the Blessing is worthy of notice: "Thou wilt find in the case of all the tribes, that the blessing of Moses is drawn from the fountain of the blessing of Jacob" (cf. Waller in Ellicott's Bible Commentary). It is true that the Book of Genesis nowhere claims to have been written by Moses. But an account of the origin of mankind or at least of the ancestors of Israel such as is given there is required to make the other four books intelligible. Furthermore, the "and" (or, now) with which Ex. i. 1 begins is an indication that this book is a continuation and only in Genesis do we find the history recorded which Exodus continues.¹

The Witness of the Rest of the Old Testament

In Joshua, there are many references to Moses.

They show that Joshua derived his authority from Moses and appealed constantly to what Moses had commanded. These references serve to define the task assigned Joshua after the death of Moses.

About the position of Joshua, Dr. Young and Dr. Allis explain as follows:

¹0. T. Allis, op. cit., p. 7.

²Allis, loc. cit.

Joshua should not be regarded as Moses' successor, for because of his exalted position, Moses had but one successor, even Christ. Joshua, however, derived his authority from Moses. The law of Moses was to be his guide and standard. Hence, we frequently find Joshua acting "as the Lord commanded Moses" (e.g., 11:15, 20, 14:2, 21:2 etc.).¹

We speak at times of Joshua as Moses' successor, but such an expression is misleading. Moses was the Law-giver: it was the duty of all who came after him to keep that law and instruct others to do so. In his farewell to Israel Joshua passed on to the elders (xxiii. 6) the obligation to obey the law of Moses, which had been solemnly laid upon him. This involved "all that is written in the book of the law of Moses." Moses had, strictly speaking, but one successor: the One who said of Himself, "A greater than Moses is here."²

There are, however, "several explicit references to the written law itself as the work of Moses;"³ note "this book of the Law" (1:7, 8); "written in the book of the Law of Moses" (8:31; cf. also verses 32, 34, 23:6); the word of the Lord by the hand of Moses" (22:9, cf. also verse 5).

In other books occasional references to Moses are found, and these are without doubt, regarded as the testimony to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch by the conservatives.

1. At the time of the conquest certain Canaanites were permitted to dwell in the land "to prove Israel by them, to know whether they would harken unto the commandments of the Lord, which he commanded their fathers by the hand of Moses" Judges 3:4).

¹Young, op. cit., p. 50.

²Allis, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

³Young, loc. cit.

2. When David bore the ark to Zion, he did so "as Moses commanded . . . " (I Chron. 15:15).
3. David charged his son Solomon to observe that which "is written in the law of Moses" (I Kings 2:3).
4. Solomon appointed the ritual of his Temple in accordance with "the commandment of Moses . . ." (I^I Chron. 8:13).
5. The high priest Jehoiada in appointing the Temple ritual "as it is written in the law of Moses . . ." (II Chron. 23:18).
6. The Northern Kingdom was taken captive because of the transgression of "all that Moses the servant of the Lord commanded" (II Kings 18:12).
7. "The Law of Moses" is prominently connected with Hezekiah's reforms (II Kings 18:6, II Chron. 30:16) and those of Josiah, (II Kings 22:8, 23:25).
8. During the captivity Daniel refers to matters contained in the Pentateuch as "written in the law of Moses" (Daniel 9:11, 13).

"The references in the prophets to Moses are rather infrequent.

For the most part, the prophets speak merely of the Law, as e.g., in Isa. 1:10."¹ "But that by this man" Dr. Allis said "the law of Moses is indicated by the fact that his is the only name ever connected with the law, Aaron being merely his mouthpiece."²

¹Young, op. cit., p. 50.

²Allis, op. cit., p. 8.

The final injunction of the last of the Old Testament is "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, even statutes and ordinances" (Malachi 4:4).

Dr. Young, concerning the witness of the Old Testament to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, concluded as follows:

The presupposition of the Old Testament witness is that there is in existence a written book known as the Law, and that the contents of this Law were given to Moses by the Lord. On the question of the authorship of the Law, the Pentateuch and the remainder of the Old Testament know of only one human author, and that author is Moses.¹

The Witness of the New Testament

Dr. Allis said that the New Testament made it quite clear that Jesus did not dispute the Old Testament canon as accepted by the Jews, but fully accepted it as the Word of God. He challenged only their misinterpretation of it and failure to follow its teaching (e.g. Luke 20:37, John 7:19).²

Jesus quoted passages of the Law as from Moses, e.g., "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives" (Matthew 19:8, Mark 10:5). Cf. Also Matthew 8:4, Mark 1:44, Luke 5:14, Mark 7:10, 12:26, Luke 20:37, 16:31, Luke 24:27, 44, John 5:47, 7:19.

Dr. Unger commented on some of these passages as follows:

In a citation from Exodus 3, Jesus calls the Pentateuch in general and Exodus in particular "the book of Moses" (Mark 12:26).

¹Young, op. cit., p. 50.

²Allis, op. cit., p. 8.

It is clear that the "writings of Moses (John 5:46, 47) to which Jesus frequently referred were the Pentateuch (Luke 16:29, 31). The Jews not only referred to the injunction of the Pentateuch as that which "Moses commanded" (John 8:5), but Jesus habitually employs the same expression (Matthew 8:4, 19:7, 8, Mark 1:44, 10:3, Luke 5:14) when referring to Mosaic legislation as a whole whether to the book of the Covenant, the Priestly Code, or the Deuteronomic Law. Jesus (John 7:19) and the evangelists assert not only that "the law was given through Moses" (John 1:17) but that he also reduced it to writing (Mark 10:5, 12:19).¹

Paul held the same view in harmony with the witness of Jesus.

Those passages appear in Acts 28:23, Romans 10:19, I Corinthians 9:9,

II Corinthians 3:15.

The conservatives regard the words "Moses" and "law" in the New Testament are equivalent expressions.

The Voice of Tradition

To the conservatives the tradition is regarded as the important confirmation for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. From evidence furnished by the Samaritan Pentateuch, which has been attributed to Moses up to the present time, it is plain that as early as the fifth century B. C. both Jews and Samaritans firmly believed the Pentateuch was of Mosaic origin. The earliest extra-canonical witness to the Old Testament canon is Ecclesiasticus which was written in the first half of the second century B. C. It said,

He (Jehovah) made him (Moses) to hear his voice and brought him into the dark cloud, and gave him commandments before his face, even the law of life and knowledge, that he might teach Jacob his covenants and Israel his judgments (Ecclus. 45:5).²

¹Unger, op. cit., pp. 218-219.

²Allis, op. cit., p. 9.

"The second book of Maccabees speaks of the 'commandment of the law' which was given by Moses" (7:30).¹ "Both Philo and Josephus ascribe Mosaic authorship to the Pentateuch."² "In the Talmud it is declared that any departure from the teaching that Moses wrote the Pentateuch would be punished by exclusion from Paradise."³

Among Christian Scholars, one of the first to refer to the "five books of Moses" is Melio, Bishop of Sardis (Cir. 175 A.D.). In all of the Canonical Scriptures given by the Church Fathers the Five Books of the Law are given a unique position; and they are frequently called the "book of Moses." The simple explanation of this tradition is that it represents the teaching of the Bible itself.⁴

This tradition is very important, especially to affirm Moses to be the author of Genesis.

B. What is Meant by Mosaic Authorship?

The conservatives firmly believe that the author of the Pentateuch is Moses, but as already stated in Chapter III, this does not mean to them that every word in the Pentateuch was necessarily written by Moses.

Dr. Young, as well as other conservatives, said:

To insist upon this would be unreasonable. Hammurabi was the author of his famous code, but he certainly did not engrave it himself upon the steel. Our Lord was the author of the Sermon upon the mount, but He did not write it Himself. Milton was the author of Paradise Lost, but he did not write it all out by hand.⁵

¹Unger, op. cit., p. 219.

²Ibid.

³Allis, op. cit. p. 9.

⁴Ibid., pp. 9-10.

⁵Young, op. cit., p. 51.

Consequently, the conservatives are not blind to believe or insist that even the account of Moses' death was written by Moses himself. They believe the possibility of later addition not only the last verses of Deuteronomy but also place to place in the Pentateuch. Also, they realize that Moses employed parts of previously existing written documents in composing the book of Genesis. They even admit that there may have been later minor additions and even revisions under Divine inspiration. With regard to the authorship of Genesis, the statement in the International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia is worthwhile to quote here.

In itself it would be possible that from time to time some explanatory and interpreting additions could have been made to the original text, in case we find indications of a later period in some statements of the book. But that in this case these additions could not have been made by any unauthorized persons, but only officially, should, in the case of a book like Genesis, be regarded as self-evident. But in our times this fact must be emphasized all the more, as in our days the most radical ideas obtain in reference to the way in which sacred books were used in former times. And then it must be said that we cannot prove as an absolute certainty that there is a single passage in Genesis that originated in the post-Mosaic period.¹

Substantially and essentially, however, the Pentateuch is regarded as the product of Moses. This position of the conservatives is unchangeable and unshakable. Genesis, the first book of the Pentateuch is, accordingly, firmly believed by the conservatives as the product of Moses.

¹J. Orr, "Genesis," The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, (ed.), II, 1212.

C. Summary

The conservatives' view concerning the authorship of Genesis is summed up as follows:

1. Genesis, the first book of the Pentateuch, is the production of Moses.
2. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is verified by the Pentateuch itself, by the rest of the Old Testament and by the New Testament.
3. According to the Samaritan Pentateuch, the second book of Maccabees, and the Talmud, Moses was traditionally the writer of the Book of Genesis.
4. Mosaic authorship of Genesis does not mean that Moses completely by revelation wrote the book without using any pre-existing sources. He might have used some materials handed down to him through his ancestors in his writing the book of Genesis.
5. Substantially, essentially, Genesis is believed to be the product of Moses.

CHAPTER VI

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE LIBERAL
AND CONSERVATIVE VIEWS

CHAPTER VI

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE VIEWS

It is necessary to review the previous chapters here briefly before the discussion of this chapter.

The views advocated by the liberals are as follows:

1. The liberals hold the hypothesis that the book of Genesis was made up of documents written by different authors, who lived during different ages. These documents and their authors are represented by the letters J, E, and P. The liberals further suppose that these original documents were combined together by writers acting as compilers, and redactors. These are designated by the letters JE and R.
2. In regard to the times in which these books, J, E, P, were produced, they hold that J and E were supposed between 900 and 750 B. C.; E came from the Northern Kingdom little later than J which was from the Southern, and P was Exilic or post-Exilic times.

The traditional view the conservatives hold, may be stated as follows:

1. Moses was the author of the book of Genesis substantially as we have it. It is not denied that Moses might have employed pre-existing sources.
2. The conservatives, at least, do not repel the suggestion that there may be several original documents combined in Genesis.

Moses might have had in his possession family registers and other memorials brought by Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees which he reproduced with omissions, additions, and other emendations according to the wisdom and inspiration which God vouchsafed to him. But the conservatives do not believe the liberals have proved the existence of the documents which they denominate J, E, and P.

What, then, made such different views one to another among the Bible scholars? The main subjects of the argument were derived from the literary difficulties in the book of Genesis such as the variations in the divine name, the alleged doublets, the variations in diction and style, and the alleged anachronisms. These subjects are also the subjects this chapter is concerned with.

A. The Variations in the Divine Names

The documentary theory found by Astruc was based on variation in the use of the divine names, Jehovah and Elohim, in Genesis. Later it was claimed by the liberals that Exodus 6:3 (P) recorded the first instance of the revelation of the name Jehovah and that all previous sections employing the name, being in conflict with this statement, must be attributed to another writer (J) who in turn held that it was known from the earliest period.

Two chief sources, based on two names for God, could perhaps as a theory and in themselves be regarded as acceptable. If the claim about Exodus 6:3 is added, it seems to be reasonable to separate the

text, which reports concerning the times before Moses and which in parts contains the name Jehovah, into two sources, one with Jehovah and the other with Elohim. But just as soon as it is concluded that the use made of the two names of God proves that there were three and not two sources, thus the conclusive ground for the division falls away. The second Elohist (E), whom Ilgen was the first to propose, in principle and a priori discredits the whole hypothesis.

This new source from the very outset covers all the passages that cannot be ascribed to the Jehovah or the Elohist portions: whatever portions contain the name Elohim, as P does, and which nevertheless are prophetic in character after the manner of J, and accordingly cannot be made to fit in either the Jehovistic or the Elohist source, seek a refuge in this third source. Even before we have done as much as look at the text, we can say that according to this method everything can be proved. And when critics go so far as to divide J and E and P into many subparts, it becomes all the more impossible to make the names for God a basis for this division into sources. Consistently we could perhaps in this case separate a Jehovah source, an Elohim source, a ha-'Elohim source, an El Shadday source, an Adho nay source, a Mal akh Yahweh source, a Mal akh Elohim source, etc, but unfortunately these characteristics of the sources come into conflict in a thousand cases with the others that are claimed to prove that there are different sources in the Book of Genesis.¹

Surely, it is not claimed by the liberals that J was ignorant of the name Elohim or P and E of the Name Jehovah, but that each preferred one of these names. But if so, the question remains, why did J prefer the name Jehovah and E and P the name Elohim? To this question the divisive hypothesis gives no satisfactory answer. If the book of Genesis, however, be the work of one author, the reason for the use of these names is more clearly and sufficiently understood. As the conservatives' view on this problem was shown in Chapter IV of this thesis,

¹J. Orr, "Genesis," The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, (ed.), II. p. 1204.

each of the two divine names has its own significant meaning. Elohim, the general name for God, had no special relation to Israel but was used many times in reference to the deities of the Gentiles, while Jehovah was the name which emphasized His covenant and redemptive relations with Israel, His chosen nation. These significances of the divine names clearly show why E, as the liberal's claim, is cold, formal, systematic and logical, while J is naive, anthropomorphic, and warm.

There are passages in which one cannot explain why one name for deity is used rather than another but in the great majority of cases, any other name would be inappropriate. That these names are carefully used in their proper places has been shown by Dr. Green who said:

The divisive hypothesis can give no reason why the Elohist rather than Jehovist should have given an account of the creation of the world and all that it contains; nor why the Jehovist rather than the Elohist should have described the beginning of God's earthly kingdom in man's primeval condition and the mercy shown him after his fall; nor why the Elohist never speaks of an altar or sacrifice or invocation or any act of patriarchal worship; nor why Jehovah occurs without interruption in the life of Abraham until in Chapter XII the divine omnipotence is pledged to fulfill the oft-repeated but long-delayed promise; nor why Elohim regularly occurs when Gentiles are concerned, unless specific reference is made to the God of the patriarchs. All this is purely accidental on the divisive hypothesis. But such evident adaptation is not the work of chance. It can only result from the intelligent employment of the divine names in accordance with their proper meaning and recognized usage.¹

Dr. Allis pointed out that "such marked variation in the use of the divine names as occurs in the opening chapters of Genesis is rare. The divine names do not occur sufficiently frequently in the book of Genesis to form the basis of a detailed analysis of the entire book."²

¹W. H. Green, The Unity of the Book of Genesis (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), pp. 547-548.

²O. T. Allis, The Five Books of Moses (Philadelphia, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1949), p. 23.

Consequently, it is natural for one to believe that the divine names were used by the single author in his writing of Genesis in proper place alternately according to their significant meanings.

The passages Exodus 6:2, 3,

God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am the Lord: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty (El Shaddai יְשׁוּבָה): but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them;

cannot possibly mean that its author was hitherto ignorant of or did not use the name Jehovah.

Significantly, the reference does not distinguish Jehovah from Elohim (occurring over 200 times in Genesis) but from El Shaddai (occurring five times in Genesis; 17:1, 28:3, 35:11, 43:14, 48:3), the name denoting the particular character in which God revealed Himself to the Patriarchs.¹

Dr. Unger continued his comment on this subject as he said:

Moreover, it must be noted, the passage does not concern itself at all with the occurrence or non-occurrence of the divine name Jehovah in the pre-Mosaic era, and cannot legitimately be regarded as denying or affirming anything about its anti-quarian usage. It concerns itself solely with a declaration of the revelation of that name, not its occurrence.²

On this discussion the comment in the International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia is more clear as follows:

If Jehovah had really been unknown before the days of Moses, as Exodus 6:3, P is claimed to prove, how could J then in so important and decisive a point in the history of the religious development of Israel, have told such an entirely different story? Or if, on the other hand, Jehovah was already known before the time of Moses, as we must conclude according to J, how was it possible for P all at once to invent a new view? This is all the more incredible since it is this author and none other who already makes use of the word Jehovah in the composition of the name

¹M. F. Unger, Introductory Guide to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 1956), p. 251.

²Ibid., pp. 251-252.

of the mother of Moses, Jochebed (cf. Ex. 6:30 and Nu. 26:59). In addition we do not find at all in Ex. 6:1 ff that God had before this revealed Himself as Elohim, but El Shadday, so that this would be a reason for claiming not an Elohim but an El Shadday source for P on the basis of this passage (cf. 17:1, 28:3, 35:11, 48:3 P --43:14 E! cf also 49:25 in the blessing of Jacob). Finally, it is not at all possible to separate Ex. 6:1ff P from that which immediately precedes, which is taken from JE and employs the name Jehovah: for according to the text of P we do not know who Moses and who Aaron really were, and yet these two are in Ex. 6:1 ff regarded as well-known persons. The new revelation of God in Ex. 6:1 ff (P) by the side of 3:1 ff (JE and E) is also entirely defensible and rests on a good foundation; for Moses after the failure of Ex. 5 needed such a renewed encouragement (see Exodus 11:2, 1). If this is the case, then the revelation of the name of Jehovah in Ex 6:1ff cannot mean that name had before this not been known at all, but that it had only been relatively unknown, i.e. that in the fullest and most perfect sense God became known only as Jehovah while before this He had His character only from certain sides, but esp. as to His Almighty Power.¹

This interpretation is wholly acceptable unless one is bound by the exigencies of some false theory and accordingly prepared to abandon the domain of legitimate exegesis. The usage of the divine names in Genesis is intentional and theologically significant as it has been shown in this discussion. There is no room to accept the documentary hypothesis by the use of divine names.

B. The Alleged Doublets

Numberless repetitions with more or less serious discrepancies and a varied diction in Genesis seem indeed, as the liberals claim, to be inconsistent with unity of authorship, and one is easily inclined to the divisive hypothesis. But when one would patiently examine those narratives he would soon find that they are not duplicate or parallel

¹Orr, op. cit., p. 1204.

accounts as the liberals assume them to be, but identical. In Chapter III of this thesis, Hamilton, Unger, and Allis already gave the answer on this subject to disprove the liberals' view. Now, this subject should be considered further.

Two or More Accounts of the Same Thing.

They are recorded as distinct, and are further shown to be distinct by differences of time, place, and circumstances. They are not different versions of the same story when a like peril befalls Sarah in Egypt (12:10), and in Gerar (20:1); or when Hagar fled from her mistress before the birth of Ishmael (16:6), and when she was subsequently sent away with Ishmael (21:12); or when God ratified his covenant with Abraham by a visible symbol (Chapter 15), and it was afterward ratified by Abraham by the seal of circumcision (Chapter 17); or when the promise of a son by Sarah was first made to Abraham (17:15-17), and then in the hearing of Sarah (18:9-12); or when Jacob obtained the blessing which his father intended for Esau (Chapter 27), and again received a parting blessing from his father as he was leaving home for Paddan-aram (28:1-5).

Variant Explanation of the Same Name.

The variant explanations of the same name in Genesis are simply allusive references to the signification of the name made on different occasions, which, of course, involves no discrepancy; or in some cases they are different suggestions awakened by the sound of the name, where there is no pretence of giving its actual derivation, and no ground for the charge that different conceptions of its etymology are involved.

Thus with allusion to the name Isaac, which means "laughter," it is related that when his birth was predicted Abraham (17:17) and Sarah also laughed incredulously (18:12), and when he was born, Sarah said that God had made her to laugh for joy, and all that hear would laugh with her (21:6). So Edom, "red," is associated with the red color of Esau at his birth (25:25), and the red pottage for which he sold his birthright (25:30). So the two-fold hire linked with the name Issachar (30:16, 18), and the double suggestion of Zebulum (30:20) and of Joseph (30:23, 24).¹ The variant explanation of the same name, accordingly, could not be the reason to hold the documentary theory.

The Creation and the Flood Stories

As already Hamilton suggested that the creation account of Chapter 1 is an account of the creation of the universe, while chapter 2 is the account of the creation of man and his surroundings.² According to 7:12, 17, 8:6, 10, 12, the flood lasted 54 days and according to 7:24 it lasted 150 days. For the liberals this is a distinct discrepancy which makes one believe the documentary hypothesis. But if one would study carefully these sections he would find the forty days of 7:12, 17, and 8:6 do not mark the total duration of the flood but of the rain itself. More excellent explanation has been made by Allis (See Chapter III of this thesis). The contrarities and discrepancies, of which such account is made as indicative of a diversity of sources thus disappear upon inspection, being mostly due to the improper

¹Green, op. cit., p. 534.

²F. E. Hamilton, The Basis of Christian Faith (New York, Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1946), p. 227.

identification of distinct events, or to a critical partition by which passages are severed from their connection and interpreted at variance with it.¹

C. The Variations in Diction and Style

Besides the variations in divine names, which form the original basis for the partition of Genesis into different documents, the liberals lay much stress upon other alleged secondary variations in diction and style in Genesis to support their theory of sources in opposition to Mosaic authorship. First, it is maintained that the book of Genesis does not employ a uniform vocabulary suggesting one author but displays lexicographic variations resulting from diversity of sources. Secondly, the alleged occurrences of numerous Aramaisms in diverse parts of Genesis supposedly point to a late date (at least for the P document). Thirdly, differences in style in the three documents prove the legitimacy of distinguishing and recognizing them as separate sources. These claims of the liberals are closely associated with the divine names, and the inadequacy of the claims has somewhat been proved.

Peculiarity of Vocabulary

According to the liberals, J. E. and P. have their own vocabularies. Driver gave a long list of words peculiar to P in pages 131 to 135 in his book Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. But this argument has no weight unless it can be shown the writer had occasion to use these particular words or expressions or that this particular

¹Green, op. cit., p. 538.

usage is unusual or rare. Along this line Dr. Unger said:

Surely common everyday words are not the peculiar possession of any one writer. By this unscientific approach a treatise of an author can be proved not to have been written by him when compared to another treatise of his, especially if the latter is upon a different subject. Or, for that matter, any part of one treatise may be used to prove that the remaining portion came from another pen.¹

Dr. Allis' critical study about the vocabularies used in the creation story section I (P) and section II (J) is quite valuable to disprove the divisive hypothesis.²

It is self-evident that certain expressions will be repeated in historical, in legal, and in other sections similar in content; but this is not enough to prove that there have been different sources. Whenever J brings genealogies or accounts that are no less systematic than those of P (cf. 4:17ff, 10:8ff, 20:20-24), or accounts and repetitions occur in the story of the Deluge (7:2ff, or 7:4, 12, 17, 8:6, or 7:4, 8:8, 10, 12), this is not enough to make the division into sources plausible. In reference to the linguistic peculiarities, it must be noted that the data cited to prove this point seldom agree. Thus, for instance, the verb אִנָּן, "create," in Genesis 1:1 is used to prove that this was written by P, but the word is found also in 6:7 in J. The same is true with the word פְּסִידָה "possession," which in 12:5, 13:6, 36:7 is regarded as characteristic of P, but in 14:11, 16, 21, is found in an unknown source (to Driver,) and in 15:14 in J. In 12:5, 13:12a, 16:3, 17:8, it is said that אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן "land of Canaan" is a proof that this was written by

¹Unger, op. cit., p. 258.

²Allis, op. cit., pp. 41-45.

P, but in chapters 42, 44, 47, 50 there is this expression in J and E. Accordingly it is a vain attempt to divide Genesis into three sources by the peculiar usage of the vocabularies of the supposed authors, J, E, p.

Alleged Aramaisms

Second charge of the liberals is that the presence of Aramaic words in a document denotes the lateness of the document. On this subject Hamilton's explanation is quite agreeable.

The critics in order to support this charge must prove first that the word alleged to be Aramaic is really Aramaic, and second that if the word is really Aramaic the presence of an Aramaic word in the Hebrew document shows the lateness of the document. According to Dr. Wilson, Kaustsch, the great Hebrew and Aramaic scholar, said that there are probably 360 Aramaic words in the Old Testament. Of these 360, 75 are found in old Babylonian documents. For example, Wellhausen alleged that the Hebrew word "to subdue" in the first chapter of Genesis, was Aramaic, and the inference was that therefore, the first chapter of Genesis was written late in History. This very word, however, if found in Babylonian documents contemporary with Hammurabi, and so could have entered the Hebrew language at any time after the time of Abraham. Now, in the first place, it is very difficult to prove a word to be Aramaic, because it is found only once or twice in the Old Testament and is also found in Aramaic. The word may be a Hebrew in Aramaic instead of being an Aramaism in Hebrew. . . . In the second place, even if a word can be shown to be an Aramaism, that does not prove it to be late. The Hebrews were in touch with Aramaic speaking people from the time of Jacob down to the end of Hebrew history, and Aramaic words may have come into Hebrew language at any time during this period . . . to charge that such documents are late because they contain Aramaic words is to ignore the historical circumstances under which the book is supposed to have been written. In the last place, there are Aramaic words in those parts of the Bible which the critics themselves date early as well as in the documents which they date late, so their whole charge that the presence of Aramaic words indicates a late date for the document containing them falls completely to the ground.¹

¹Hamilton, op. cit., pp. 239-240.

Dr. Unger also suggested that "close relationship between Hebrews and Aramaeans from patriarchal times (Genesis 31:47) offers sufficient explanation" (See Chapter III of this writing). Consequently this argument of the liberals fails to prove the incredibility of the Mosaic authorship of Genesis.

The Variation of Style

The liberals also urge the fact that certain distinct forms of expression are traceable in different parts of Genesis, to show that this indicates that different authors produced the parts in question. This claim sounds reasonable, as it was already shown in Chapter II of this writing, some parts of Genesis are prophetic in style and picturesque and fascinating in description (J), while some parts are systematic and logical (E), and some parts are very marked formal style (P). But since the conservatives do not deny that Moses used various source documents in the preparation of the book of Genesis, there is no way of showing that he did not take over some of the characteristics of the style as well. The whole practice, however, of dividing the text of the book of Genesis into various sources on the basis of style is extremely questionable. In Genesis there are historical narratives, genealogies, poetical portions which call for variety of vocabulary and versatility of treatment. Certainly when one believes Moses to be the author of Genesis it is quite natural to be convinced that Moses by education, talents and culture was equal to the task of writing now as a narrator, now as an orator, now as a prophet or poet. It is unreasonable to deny Moses the ability to modify his style and diction in accordance with the demands of

his varying subject matter. It must also be observed that

Occidental methods of literary criticism must not be foisted upon an ancient Oriental book. Modern criticism has grievously transgressed in this respect. The idiomatic use of the conjunction "and" cannot be ignored as Semitic stylistic devices and prostituted to support the vagaries of the documentary theory.¹

D. Alleged Anachronisms

In regard to the authorship of Genesis the liberals attempted to ascertain the period when Genesis was composed, from a few passages in it, which they say were anachronisms if Moses was really the author of the book.

Among such passages are, in particular, Genesis 7:6, 13:7, "and the Canaanite was then in the land." This remark, the critics say, could only have been made by the writer who lived in Palestine after the extirpation of the Canaanites. But the sense of the passage is not that Canaanites had not as yet been extirpated, but "merely that Abraham, on his arrival in Canaan, had already found there the Canaanites."² This notice was necessary since the author subsequently describes the intercourse between Abraham and the Canaanites.

Genesis 14:14 refers to the town of Dan, but in the Mosaic era, it is claimed by the liberals, the town was known as Lesham (Joshua 19:47) or Laish (Judges 18:29). There is no definite proof that the "Dan" of Genesis 14:14 is the same city referred to in Joshua and Judges. "But the last two passages speak of quite a different place.

¹Unger, *op. cit.*, p. 261.

²S. Fallows, ed., *The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia*, (Chicago, The Howard-Severance Co.) Vol. II., p. 698.

There were two places called 'Dan;' Dan-Jaan (2 Sam. 24:6) and Dan-Laish or Lesham."¹

In Genesis, they further add, frequently occurs the name Bethel (12:8, 28:19, 35:15): while even in the time of Joshua, the place was as yet called Luz (Josh. 18:13).

But the name Bethel was not first given to the place by the Israelites in the time of Joshua, there being no occasion for it, since Bethel was the old patriarchal name, which the Israelites restored in the place of Luz, a name given by the Canaanites.²

Genesis 36:31-39 catalogues a list of Edomite rulers. The notation "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (verse 31 is supposed to have been written at a period when the Jews had already a king over them.

The simple meaning, unforced by the critical theory, is that the list of Edomite rulers is pre-Mosaic and Moses emphasized the singularity that Jacob, who had the promise of kings in his line of descent (35:11), as yet had none, although just beginning his national existence, while Esau, who possessed no such promise already had a line of princes.³

This discussion is very important to prove the Mosaic unity of Genesis by which the liberals' assumption of dating the product of supposed documents J, E and P, is fallen on the shaking ground.

E. Summary

The main subjects which divided the Bible scholars up-to-date into two parts, one the liberals and the other conservatives, have been examined. The grounds, upon which the existence of documents in

¹Ibid., p. 698.

²Ibid.

³Unger, op. cit., p. 263.

Genesis rests, have now been shown to be invalid. The divine names in repeated instances fail to correspond with the requirements of the divisive hypothesis since this is most satisfactorily accounted for from their own proper signification. The alleged doublets vanish upon examination, being created by the liberals themselves, and due either to misinterpretation or the identification of distinct events. The variation of diction and style is due to differences in the subject matter and not to a diversity of writers. The alleged anachronisms are supposed misplacements by the liberals. One would find himself confused and astray in the documentary hypothesis, and it increases rather than removes the difficulties, besides casting doubt and aspersion upon the historical reliability and authenticity of Genesis itself. The liberals' view of the literary sources and the authorship of Genesis cast simply dark shadows on the Bible students.

There is no way to disprove the Mosaic authorship of the book of Genesis, and the documentary hypothesis is a mere hypothesis. The traditional conservative theories of the literary sources and the Mosaic authorship of Genesis are more reasonable and stronger than those of the liberals.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

A. Summary

An introductory study of Genesis was based on the literary sources and the authorship of the book. This study has been proceeded by the viewpoints of the liberals and the conservatives alternately. The liberal and the conservative views were comparatively analyzed in the last chapter.

In the second chapter the liberal view concerning literary sources of Genesis was presented. The modern liberal view of higher criticism was started by Astruc when he divided Genesis into two sources, J and E, according to the use of the divine names. Since, the literary analysis concentrated on the book of Genesis and extended to the whole Pentateuch. Through Eichhorn, DeWette, Hupfeld, Graf, Wellhausen, The First Documentary Theory proceeded to the Fragmentary Hypothesis, to the Development Hypothesis, then finally to the New Documentary Hypothesis. Thus the book of Genesis is supposed to contain three documents: J, the Jehovist, E, the Elohist, and P, the Priestly Code which was the 1st Elohist of Hupfeld.

Chapter three dealt with the conservative view concerning the literary sources of Genesis. The conservatives do not believe the existence of the J, E, P, sources in the book of Genesis. They maintain that the variations of the divine names, alleged parallel passages, and the variations of vocabulary and style attribute to the talents and

skill of an excellent single writer, Moses, who used the pre-existing materials, oral and written, and wrote Genesis by the inspiration of God.

In Chapter Four the liberal views of the authorship of Genesis were seen. Since they hold the documentary theory they maintain that the original documents were the products of J, E, and P. They place J and E at least between the limits of 900 and 750 B.C. and P in Exilic or post-Exilic times. The present form of Genesis is supposed to be the work of Redactor (R).

The fifth chapter stated the conservative view of the authorship of Genesis. The conservatives, consistently and unanimously, believe the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship of the book of Genesis. They ascertain their belief by the witnesses of the Pentateuch itself, the rest of the Old Testament, New Testament, and with the voice of Tradition.

In the last chapter, the liberal views of the literary sources and authorship of Genesis were compared and analyzed with those of the conservatives on the subjects of the variation of the divine names, the alleged doublets, the variation of diction and style, and on the subject of the alleged anachronisms. Finally it came to the conclusion that a survey of the literary problems of Genesis and the manner in which the modern critical hypothesis dealt with them had demonstrated that the solution offered by the liberals was not only inadequate, but increased rather than removed the difficulties. The liberal theory cast only a doubt and aspersion upon the historical reliability and authenticity of Genesis itself. All problems, thus, were solved when one believed the Mosaic authorship of Genesis finally!

B. Conclusions

As a result of this study, the writer submits the following conclusions:

1. In comparison of the liberal and conservative views, it is shown that the liberal theories are confounded and inadequate, while the liberals claim that the higher criticism to be scientific and systematic in the field of the study of the Bible.
2. The liberal's documentary theory and the denial of the Mosaic authorship of Genesis are based on their anthropocentric evolutionary rationalism and anti-supernaturalism.
3. The liberals manufactured only confusion to the Bible students.
4. All the arguments amassed by the liberals to deny Mosaic authorship of Genesis singly fail.
5. There is no way to disprove the Mosaic authorship of Genesis, and the documentary theory is a mere hypothesis.
6. The traditional faith in respect to the Mosaic authorship and historical truth of the book is only reliable.
7. Genesis, the first book of the Holy Bible, is given to human by God through His man, Moses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books

- Allis, O. T., The Five Books of Moses. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1949.
- Bacon, B. W., The Genesis of Genesis. London: The Student Publishing Co., 1893.
- Cartledge, S. A., A Conservative Introduction to the Old Testament. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1944.
- Driver, S. R., An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- Green, W. H., The Unity of the Book of Genesis. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.
- Hamilton, F. E., The Basis of Christian Faith. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1946.
- Henry, C. F. H., ed., Revelation and the Bible. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1958.
- Keil, K. F., Historio - Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 38, George Street, 1892.
- McFadyen, T. D., Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, n.d.
- Orr, J., The Problem of the Old Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.
- Pfeiffer, R. H., The Books of the Old Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1959.
- Raven, J. H., Old Testament Introduction. New York: Fleming H. Ravell Company, 1906.
- Unger, M. F., Introductory Guide to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1956.
- Young, E. J., An Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954.

B. The Encyclopaedias

Follows, S., ed., The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopaedia.
Chicago: The Howard-Severance Co. Vol. II. 1911.

McClintock, J., ed., Biblical Theological and Ecclesiastical Cyclo-
paedia. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers. Vol. III.
1894.

Orr, J., ed., The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia. Grand
Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. Vol. II. 1947.

C. Genesis in Commentaries

Schaff, P., ed., Lange's Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's
Sons, 1915.

Skinner, J., The International Critical Commentary, Genesis. New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.