

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

between the account of Mark and those of Matthew and Luke, consistency required that Reuss should have gone on to admit, as I feel constrained to do, that the three synop-
tists wrote in perfect independence of one another.

F. GODET.

*RECENT LITERATURE ON THE OLD
TESTAMENT.*

A SINGLE phrase sums up the tendency of most of the recent German literature on the Old Testament—in the wake of Wellhausen. The drift, even of very conservative scholars, towards the position to which he carried the conclusions of Graf with so brilliant a sweep is unmistakable, and is all the more significant, that it has continued to be so strong since he himself, forsaking Hebrew for Arabic, ceased to contribute to it. The displacement he caused was large, and how real has been proved by its power to disturb even such critics as might have been thought to have taken up their final moorings. Though there may be none of these who will follow Wellhausen all his way, there are also none who have not been carried considerably nearer to him, and are now reconsidering from the new standpoint their former statements of the history and religion of Israel. It is too late in the day to review Delitzsch's changes in this respect, the second volume of whose commentary on *Genesis*, translated by Sophia Taylor, forms part of the first issue for 1889 of Messrs. Clark's Foreign Theological Library. But we may give some account of two volumes just published, which are interesting above all for the attitude of their writers to Wellhausen's principles. These are Baudissin's *Geschichte des Alttestamentlichen Priesterthums*, and the fourth edition of Schultz's *Alttestamentliche Theologie*.

Count Baudissin's researches into the history of the Old

Testament priesthood¹ are characterized by all the fulness of material and exhaustive treatment that made and have kept his *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte* invaluable to the student. As was to be expected, a much larger part of this volume is devoted to criticism than to historical statement; and the chief aim of the criticism is to fix the date of the Levitical legislation, the Priests'-Code, relatively to the rest of Old Testament laws on the subject. Almost no one doubts now that the Priests'-Code (cited as P) comes second to the Book of the Covenant and the long historical narrative portion of the Pentateuch (cited as J E), in which the latter is incorporated. But where is P to stand in the subsequent series—Deuteronomy (D), Ezekiel, and the post-exilic legislation in Ezra and Nehemiah? It will be remembered (if we may repeat an old story), that all four collections,—J E, D, Ezekiel, and the post-exilic writings,—reveal in the order of their dates a certain orderly development of legislation upon the following points: the distinction between the priestly class and the laity, the distinction within the priestly class between the descendants of Aaron and the common Levites; the dues paid to priests; the high priest; and the one sanctuary. J E makes little difference between priests and laity, and none at all within the priestly class; says nothing of dues to priests, and speaks with toleration of several sanctuaries. D knows no distinction between Aaron's family and other Levites, but insists upon a central sanctuary, and gives direction for the support of the priests. Ezekiel makes—according to Wellhausen, he originates—a severe distinction between the sons of Zadok and the rest of the Levites, whom he degrades to be ministers of the temple in place of the uncircumcised foreigners tolerated in

¹ *Die Geschichte des Alttestamentlichen Priesterthums untersucht* von Wolf Wilhelm Grafen Baudissin, Prof. der Theol. an der Universität Marburg. (Leipzig, S. Hirzel, 1889. Pp. xvi and 312.)

the first temple, but now to be banished from the sacred precincts; he elaborates the system of dues, but he has no high priest. This personage appears for the first time in the post-exilic books, which also seriously extend the priestly revenues, distinguish between priests and Levites, and further specialise the temple staff into singers, doorkeepers and Nethinim. In this certainly historical development, it is the latest and most elaborate stage to which P shows closest, though by no means absolute, resemblance. P mentions no sacrifices before Moses, emphasises the single sanctuary, the distinction between priests and Levites, the position of the high priest and the priestly dues, but does not specialise the Levites into the several classes, into which they are told off in Ezra and Nehemiah, and appear to have been divided even before the exile. P contains also apparently exilic elements, though these might be taken for later insertions, whose presence would not preclude the question of a pre-exilic date for the bulk of the document. The case is a very difficult one, and in face of it Wellhausen's wholesale withdrawal of P to Ezra's time is audacious enough to provoke a pretty confident opposition. It is as opposing Wellhausen on this question of the date of P that Baudissin appears; but his volume is much more than a mere advocate's brief for a side in the case. It is one of the most full and exhaustive treatments of the whole case which have yet appeared, and if it cannot be regarded as a final solution, it will not fail to approve itself as affording real help towards this, and providing a larger thesaurus of the material of the question than is elsewhere available. Baudissin's method is to state the contents of P as far as the priesthood is concerned, and then to compare these with the analogous parts, in turn, of J E, D, Ezekiel, the post-exilic books, the earlier historical books, the prophets and the poetic writings. This occupies 260 pages, and then

the volume concludes with a forty-page chapter of summary narrative entitled "Historical Results."

The most successful part of the argument will be felt to be that which is directed against the post-exilic origin of P. One of Wellhausen's reasons for attributing P to Ezra—and this is one of the frequent instances in which Wellhausen overstates his case—is its stiff, artificial and absolutely isolated character; also that, unlike other parts of the Pentateuch, it betrays no allusion to the fact that Israel is already settled in the land, and the murmur of running history is never audible in it. Baudissin (without referring to Wellhausen) strategically begins by pleading for P quite another character. "The apparently closely mortised organization of P is only an organization in process of growth at the time the author wrote, the separate parts of which were partly not then old, and partly not then observed." Other arguments (partly repeated from Delitzsch, Dillmann, Nöldeke and Riehm) are, that P is presupposed by the arrangements in Zerubbabel's time as well as Ezra's; that there are points emphasised by Ezekiel which P ignores; and that P does not exactly correspond to the ranking of the temple service which appears in Ezra and Nehemiah. Baudissin urges with great force that if the composition of P had been so wholly a matter of Ezra's time, P would not have been content with its own simple distinction among the priest-class, but must have said more of the singers and doorkeepers, who are so frequently mentioned by Ezra and Nehemiah. On the other hand, Baudissin does not help his argument by explaining the remarkable omission from P of all provision for civil government—which of course is held by Wellhausen to point to a date for P when Israel was not responsible for her own government—by the suggestion that P was written when the civil government was in unquestioned activity, and therefore beyond the need of legislation.

In carrying his argument farther back, and attempting to prove P prior to Ezekiel, Baudissin's chief difficulty is the high priest. If P was earlier than, and known to, Ezekiel—as P must have been, if in existence—why did Ezekiel omit the high priest? The answer to this objection (p. 131) is ingenious, but not convincing. There is more success in the attempt to refute Graf's opinion that Ezekiel's distinction between priests and Levites is original, and strong reasons are given for supposing Ezekiel's limitation of the priesthood proper to the family of Zadok to be necessarily a step subsequent to P's less strict limitation of it to the descendants of Aaron. But I think that, on this point, Baudissin has not recognised the very remarkable fact, that Ezra's practice in the admission of the sons of Ithamar to the priesthood alongside of the descendants of Zadok conforms to P's directions rather than to Ezekiel's. So that the order cannot have been so steadily, as Baudissin would have it, towards a more strict exclusiveness; and on this point P may be placed as easily after, as before, Ezekiel.

Baudissin however is not content to have placed P before Ezekiel. Like Dillmann, he will prove P's priority even to Deuteronomy. In doing so he has, of course, to make Dillmann's great concession. It is so plain that D does not know of the existence of P, that those who would put P first must grant its existence till after D merely as a *Privatschrift*: that is, in circulation only within some priestly guild of Jerusalem, and therefore the less likely to be heard of by the author of D, who wrote, not in the interest of the Jerusalem sanctuary, but for the purpose of securing at that sanctuary, when it became alone legitimate, the rights of the provincial priests. On the same ground the simpler cultus of D, often used as an argument for its priority to the more elaborate P, may be explained as due to D's fidelity to the primitive worship of the rural altars. All

these points Baudissin makes well and fairly. Against the objection that a document, which confines itself so rigidly to the representation of a single sanctuary, and makes no reference to the possibility of others, could scarcely have been written at a date when these latter existed and a polemic against them was raging, he replies that a picture of a single sanctuary, so simple and so unconscious of rivals, was the likeliest weapon in such a polemic. Yet it strikes us that if P were used at all for polemical purposes before D, the latter, in pursuit of the same end, would have betrayed some sympathy with so strong and presumably so ancient an ally. The difficulty of supposing the existence of P during the great struggle against the high places of Judah is the utter difference of its standpoint from that of the chief champions of the struggle, the prophets. Baudissin is on firmer ground when he enforces the necessity of some code of worship during the period of the kings: it is almost inconceivable that the temple and hierarchy were so far developed, as the diatribes of the prophets and the historical notices of the books of Kings reveal them to have been, without an even elaborate Torah. Whether this Torah was a written one is another question; whether, if written, it was P itself, is still a third question. Baudissin does not directly deal with the probability of a written Torah; but he makes some points, which go to show that P might, in part at least, have been in existence at the time: for example, P's failure to carry out through its whole extent the distinction between priests and Levites; the significant fact, that while the duties of the priests are detailed both for the wilderness and Canaan, the duties of the Levites are detailed only for the wilderness, from which he infers that the separation of Levites and priests was still novel to the author of P; and the evidence that to P the "Levites" are not necessarily members of the tribe of Levi, but a designation for

all temple servants, equivalent to Nethinim—a use of the term impossible to Ezekiel or Ezra. On all these points Baudissin makes out a good case for his plea that the Levitical legislation was of gradual growth, a great part of it falling in a time when Israel's history was still unwritten, the distinctions in the temple service recent, and other matters not so elaborate as they became by the time of the exile. Thus he increases evidence for the difficulties which beset Wellhausen's absolute relegation of P to Ezra. But we doubt whether he has succeeded in fastening P down so definitely as to the middle of the seventh century. If however the date of P still remains a problem, it is not the fault of this essay. There could not be a more fair, conscientious and well informed statement of the problem. The fault is in the data themselves. How the problems of the Pentateuch increase as you read each new attempt to solve them! Not that agreement does not gradually spread. As we have said, the most striking feature of present essays from the more conservative German critics, like Baudissin, is their almost entire resignation to the task of searching for the relative dates of the different parts of the Pentateuch on *this* side the eighth century. Of Moses' relation to the Pentateuch this is the most Baudissin will allow himself to say: "Dass Mose einen Priesterstand einsetzte oder doch dass es in Israel einen solchen seit dem Aufenthalt in der Sinai-Wüste gab, darf als geschichtlich angesehen werden, wenn auch die Regelung des Priesterstandes und die Abgrenzung der Laienbefugnisse ihm gegenüber vor der Einwanderung in Kanaan und noch lange nachher bis in die Königszeit hinein vielfach unsicher blieben." This is vague enough; it cannot be final. The Pentateuch problem surely is not to be altogether settled, as most recent attempts, even in conservative quarters, are seeking to settle it, on this side of the eighth century. Apart from other questions, justice to such

facts as the long influence of Egypt on the people, with the traces it has left on the language of the Pentateuch, the considerable time when there was a single sanctuary, and the traces in P itself of laws so old that to D they are obsolete, must keep open ways of return to an earlier date for at least a large portion of the Pentateuch.

In turning to the new edition of Schultz's *Old Testament Theology* we observe even more measurable traces of Wellhausen's influence; for the first edition appeared twenty years ago, when the reigning scheme of Hebrew history was that represented by Ewald. The second edition appeared in 1878, the same year as Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*. It contained a number of concessions to the new theory, and especially the most important of all, that P (cited by Schultz as A) was later than Deuteronomy. But there was not then time to attempt an entire reconstruction of Old Testament Theology on the new foundation. This fourth edition however (the third being a mere reprint of the second) has been "völlig umgearbeitet." The arrangement of contents is much transposed. An introduction and two main divisions take the place of the introduction, the divisions and the appendix of the last edition. The first division is a historical sketch of over three hundred pages of the "Entwicklung der Religion und Sitte Israel's bis zur Aufrichtung des Hasmonäerstattes." What was given in fragments, some of it even in an appendix, is here brought together. This is a great gain in method, and will make the book more useful than ever to students. The second division, under the title "Das Heilbewusstsein Israels und seine religiöse Weltanschauung als Ergebniss der Religionsgeschichte des Volkes," gathers up in dogmatic form in separate chapters the summary of Israel's religious consciousness and doctrine in the period of the second temple. We turn with curiosity to the chapter on the "Periods and Sources of Old Testament Theology." Here there is a defi-

nite denial to David of all psalms except the eighteenth; in the second edition Schultz still left him some others. The Jehovist (cited as B) is assigned to as early a date as Solomon's, which is argued for in two pages; and the younger Elohist (C) to the beginning of the eighth century. Schultz will not bring back the Priestercodex so far as Baudissin; but he holds as firmly as Baudissin does to the impossibility of its late-exilic date, and assigns it to the very beginning of the exile. Space does not permit us to give a longer review of this book, as indispensable as ever to the student.

Both volumes of the first half of Messrs. Clark's Foreign Theological Library deal with the Old Testament. Besides the second volume of Delitzsch's *Genesis*, we have Von Orelli's *Isaiah*, translated by Professor Banks. The latter appeared along with the same author's *Jeremiah* in the first Old Testament number of Zöckler and Strack's "Kurzgefasstes Commentar," a series whose temper, although its authors accept most modern critical results, is distinctly conservative. Orelli's introductions are excellent, with one or two exceptions. The limits of his space happily excuse him from repeating the opinions of all his predecessors, and for the most part he avoids the irreconcilable and futile arguments from style, fairly stating the historical features. He is not very clear however about xiii., xiv.; without committing himself to the authenticity of these chapters, he gives a series of reasons for it, which are simply dissipated by his subsequent adherence to an exilic authorship for xl.-lxvi. He is more bold to retain xxiv.-xxvii. for Isaiah; of xxxiv., xxxv. he will only say that there is no necessity for denying them to Isaiah. Hezekiah's psalm he counts genuine. On xl.-lxvi. he states the argument for the exilic authorship with clearness, but, I think, with only half the force which is available along

that line. He makes almost entirely, as is right, for the familiar historical proof: that the earlier chapters deal with Cyrus as "a well-known hero of the day." That is certain; but it may be weighted with this far more important and—against all opposing reasons whatever—utterly conclusive fact, that not only is Cyrus represented as in the swing of his career, but that the whole of the argument in chapters xli. ff. depends on this. These chapters are a vindication of Jehovah's righteousness. By previous oracles Jehovah had promised a redeemer for His people. Cyrus is the fulfilment of that promise, the proof (which is the thing the chapters are engaged in adducing) that Jehovah has kept His word. The chapters are not prophecies of the certainty of Cyrus' coming; *they are triumphant appeals to the fact that he has come.* This is sufficient reply to those who irrelevantly ask, "But was it not possible for Isaiah to predict the name of Cyrus one hundred and fifty years before?" Good people, your question does not need an answer! It should never have been raised; there is nothing in the text itself to start it. These prophecies do not claim to predict the Persian or his name; the evidence with which they rush into court is, that he *has come*, as earlier prophecies, which they mention, intimated he would. If Cyrus be not there in the flesh, they are worthless. Orelli therefore, when he points to Cyrus, merely as if his name were an allusion betrayed by the prophet to his own day, states but half the proof for the exilic authorship of xl. ff. The whole proof, and it is simply inexpugnable, is, that the appearance of Cyrus—Cyrus there in the flesh, visible to the heathen, and shortly to be felt by them in all his weight of war—is an essential element in the prophet's proof of the Divine righteousness. Orelli maintains the unity of the whole prophecy in its present form, including lii., liii.; but he has not, I think, fully stated the difficulties in connexion with lvi. ff. On the commen-

tary itself as a whole great praise is to be bestowed, and one is not disposed to quarrel with a few defects where there is so much that is excellent in so brief a form. More frequent explanations of *tsedeq* and *tsadiq* would have been desirable, for the word has many meanings in Isaiah, on some of which the argument actually turns, and even within one verse (lvi. 1) the word is used in a double sense. The historical illustrations to the prophecies referring to Isaiah's own day are almost invariably pertinent and adequate. Professor Banks has produced a satisfactory translation.

The value of the Old Testament for Christian ethics has been very oppositely estimated in the high places of theology. Schleiermacher and Rothe represent the extreme views. Schleiermacher will have nothing to do with the Old Testament. Judaism, according to him, is on the same level with paganism, as contributing to Christianity. "There is a jump" from both to the new dispensation. The sole causes for the survival of the use of the Jewish Scriptures to the present day are the New Testament appeals to them, and the historic connexion between the Christian cult and the Jewish synagogue. In modern Christianity the Old Testament has neither apologetic nor ethical value. "For our ethics it is entirely superfluous." Rothe's view is the very opposite. "The ethical ideas of the Old Testament have not to wait for the New to be obtained in their purity. It is just in the department of ethics that both Testaments stand upon the same degree of clearness. The Holy Ghost can speak in different tongues; but where, as in the whole canonical Bible, He speaks pure and undimmed through the human spirit, there also His principles and ideas are everywhere the same." Pastor Fischer, of Bessingen, in a pamphlet just published,¹

¹ *Das Alte Testament und die Christliche Sittenlehre.* (Gotha: F. A. Perthes, 1889, pp. 161.)

rightly charges both of these views with the same defect, a want of vision for the historical development of the kingdom of God ; and he has set himself the task of investigating on "strictly historical principles" with both a scientific and practical purpose, the relations of the ethics of the two Testaments. It is a needful task, and the proper method to pursue it. Pastor Fischer has accomplished a comprehensive and very suggestive essay, which would have been a greater success if it had been written more concisely and divided into sections. The bulk of it consists of a review and apology for the law of Jehovah and the religious consciousness of Israel. This however is not conducted upon "strictly historical principles." The Old Testament is simply divided between "Mosaism" and "prophetism," which latter term includes the theology of the Psalms. Although the author intimates that he does not accept the whole of the Old Testament as authentic, he ranges all the former as the earlier development of Judaism, and regards the latter, not as a movement hostile to the law, but, on the contrary, "prophetism is the truest interpreter of Mosaism." In vindicating this theory, the author does not appear to have adequately treated the declarations against sacrifice which occur both in the prophets and in the Psalms. It is certainly not a true historic instinct which inspires the clause: "In the moral life of Israel prophetism nowhere signifies a higher step"; *i.e.* than Mosaism. A defence of the imprecatory psalms, with an analysis of what constitutes righteous and what unrighteous vengeance, is ingenious and suggestive. The explanation of the psalmist's asseverations of self-righteousness is good, but it is not on such details that the defects of the author's method become evident. There is no treatment, for instance, of the development of so manifold an idea as "righteousness," and no attempt to show what elements in the idea passed into the New Testament and

received prominence there. Rightly asserting that ethics take their character from the dogmatic principles to which they are attached, Fischer emphasises that the Old and New Covenants were between the same God and the same people, but that while under the former He was represented as the Lord and they as the slaves, He as the Redeemer and they as the redeemed, who were bound to Him not only by fear, but by gratitude for merciful deliverances, in the New Testament He is the Father of His people, who especially inspires their conduct to Him by His self-sacrifice,—an infinitely more illuminating and stimulating standard for ethics than even the mercy exhibited in the redemption of Israel from Egypt, from which the Decalog derives its motive. This distinction is finely stated. “It is neither new maxims nor new revelations” that make the difference between the ethics of the Old and the New Testaments, but “new realities.” These “realities” are Christ’s sinlessness, His self-sacrifice, His resurrection and gift of eternal life, and the fact that the men to whom He addressed the old law were themselves new creatures—no longer mere servants of God, but children. On these points Pastor Fisher is historically correct and very stimulating.

The first issue for 1889 of Stade’s *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* contains, as usual, a number of laborious and useful studies. M. J. Derenbourg prints, with a short introduction and notes, the first thirty-two chapters of R. Saadia’s Arabic version of Isaiah in Hebrew letters. Dr. Benzinger analyses Leviticus xvi., the law of the great day of atonement, and draws the conclusion “that the chapter consists of two entirely different laws, which originally had only this in common, that in both there occurs an entrance of the high priest to the holy of holies: the first is an ordinance as to the conditions on

which Aaron can enter the holy of holies without danger; the second is the institution of an annual feast of atonement and its ritual." Dr. Holzinger, repentent in Tübingen, gives a very long and valuable analysis of the vocabulary, orthography, syntax and grammar of the book of Joel, with the result that he grants his adherence to those who place the book very late. In last year's *Zeitschrift*, Professor Smend had an able article. "Über das *Ich* der Psalmen," which carried the theory, that the first personal pronoun, when used in the Psalms, refers to the community and not to the individual, to so extreme a length, that protests were to be expected. One of these, and a very wise one it is, is published in this *Zeitschrift* by Dr. J. Z. Schurmans Stekhoven. He has little difficulty in pointing to one or two instances where the first personal pronoun can only mean an individual, as Psalm lxix. 9, and very justly remarks that where, as in the sixth Psalm, an undoubted reference to the whole community comes in at the close, that is not to be allowed to translate into its own terms a patent description of an individual in the earlier part of the psalm, but we must recognise in it the turn given to what was originally an individual's psalm so as to adapt it to congregational use. This is a most sensible view. To maintain that "the I" of the Psalms must throughout be congregational, simply because the Psalter was the song-book of the second temple, and to seek to force certain irresistibly individual features of its use into that absolute rule by interpreting them as proverbs or metaphors, is thoroughly unscientific, and Stekhoven is right that "each psalm is to be interpreted by itself," or more correctly, as we have seen above from Psalm vi., each verse of a psalm. O. Gruppe discusses the question, "War Genesis vi. 1-4 ursprünglich mit der Sintflut verbunden?" and Prof. Budde sends a note on Habbakuk ii. 3 ff., in which he pleads for the more frequent omission of the particle ׀ in trans-

lation, as only equivalent to the Greek $\delta\tau\iota$ in introducing indirect speech,—a meaning long recognised in Hebrew grammar but not yet sufficiently attended to in translation.

The Latin Heptateuch Published Piecemeal by the French Printer William Morel (1560) and the French Benedictines E. Martène (1733) and J. B. Pitra (1852-88), Critically Reviewed by John E. B. Mayor M.A. Professor of Latin in the University of Cambridge, is the title of a volume (pp. lxxiv and 270) just issued by C. J. Clay & Sons. In 1560 Morel printed, from a thirteenth century MS., 165 lines of a paraphrase of Genesis in Latin hexameters. In 1733 nearly 1,300 verses were added by Martène from a MS. of the ninth century. The late Cardinal Pitra, from other MSS., in 1852, completed Genesis, and printed for the first time Exodus, Deuteronomy and Joshua, with parts of Leviticus and Numbers, and in 1888 the rest of Leviticus and Numbers with Judges. The poem in its first discovered fragments was assigned now to Tertullian and now to Cyprian, but later on to Juvencus, the fifth century Spaniard, who put so many Bible subjects into Latin verse; and of Juvencus' authorship Pitra remained convinced till his death. Lucian Müller, however, in 1860 disposed of Juvencus' claims to the satisfaction of most critics, and suggested for the poem a Gallic author, who is now generally identified by the authorities as Cyprian, third Bishop of Toulon in the first half of the ninth century. All this and much more of an interesting literary history, is set forth by Prof. Mayor in his "advertisement." Professor Mayor critically reviews the poem in the interests of Latin scholarship, hoping for some contributions to lexicography and etymology. But this part of his work is outside the scope of our review.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.