

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VI

JANUARY 1908

NUMBER I

JOHN KNOX AS STATESMAN.

It was unfortunate that the recent celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of John Knox should have taken place in the midst of a discussion as to the accuracy of the hitherto accepted date of that event. There is no longer much room for doubt that the challenge of Dr. Hay Fleming was well founded, and that the Reformer was born, not in 1505, but in 1515, and died at the age of fifty-seven. The commemoration, nevertheless, was highly successful, and revived the impression of Knox's great personality and his unique services. It called forth also some excellent additions to the literature of the subject, among which Professor Cowan's contribution to an American series of admirable monographs on the *Heroes of the Reformation* is one of the best. Mr. Andrew Lang's extraordinary outburst has affected no reputation but his own.

We propose in the present paper to consider Knox in one aspect only—that of statesman. That a man, who was simply parish minister of Edinburgh, and who never but for a few months in an emergency undertook any political function, should nevertheless be classed as a statesman, and one of the most capable and successful statesmen of his time, will seem strange to no one who really knows the history of Scotland during Queen Mary's reign.

EZEKIEL AND THE MODERN DATING OF THE PENTATEUCH.*

The usefulness of Ezekiel for the higher critic of the Pentateuch centers in three things: the book, the man and the time.

1. The *book* of Ezekiel, with one exception the largest of the prophets, is undisputed as to either its genuineness or its integrity. Here is a great mass of literature, filling over 80 pages of our Hebrew Bibles, about which there is no critical "problem" beyond that afforded by the correction of its text. For the purposes of the higher criticism the whole book is a *datum*. The contrast between this condition of affairs in the case of Ezekiel, and the state of confusion and division in the case of almost every other book of the Old Testament, is sufficient in itself to point to Ezekiel as worthy of a special place in this difficult field.

2. The *author* of this book was a prophet, with a prophet's interest in the history of Israel's political, social and moral life. But Ezekiel was also a priest, with a priest's interest in the history of Israel's sanctuary, hierarchy and ceremonial. Now the two elements that combine to make the subject-matter of the Pentateuch are just these two phases of Hebrew religion: *viz.*, the record of God's dealings with the fathers of the nation, first, in founding, organizing and establishing this people of Israel as a political unit, as a social organism, and as a moral force in the world; and second, in instituting and regulating a certain system, in which the religious life of this people should express itself in outward, universal, obligatory observances. We should therefore expect that to be true of Ezekiel which

* Inaugural address delivered before the Board of Directors in Miller Chapel, December 17, 1907, on induction into the Elliott F. Shepard Assistant Professorship of Oriental and Old Testament Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary.

examination abundantly verifies,—that for this exiled prophet-priest every phase of the system of traditions and laws embodied for us in the Pentateuch possessed the deepest interest.

3. The *time* when Ezekiel lived was the exile, that transitional period when the older Israel was being transmuted into the younger Judaism. It is to this period that the Graf-Wellhausen school of criticism refers the impulse that eventually produced the largest of the documents or groups of documents into which divisive criticism sunders the Pentateuch, the so-called Priests' Code (P). If the Priests' Code is of post-exilic origin, it is younger than Ezekiel. If it is of pre-exilic origin, it is prior to Ezekiel. If it is of Mosaic origin, even then the first logical step in the argument to prove this, is to establish its priority to Ezekiel,—then to the earlier literature. For if it be not pre-exilic, it cannot be Mosaic. Whatever, therefore, be the view maintained by any critic of the Priests' Code, it is clear that the book which should possess for him the primary place of interest and investigation is the book of Ezekiel.

Such a book, written by such a man at such a time, affords the most favorable opportunity for putting to the objective test of facts, an hypothesis which asserts that this largest constituent element of the Pentateuch, the Priests' Code, was written subsequently to Ezekiel's day. It is to this test that attention is specifically directed.

In investigations that are to determine the priority of Ezekiel or of the Priests' Code, the same caution must be observed as every problem of literary resemblance requires for its solution. In any given instance, after the preliminary question has been answered, Is this a genuine case of literary relationship, or is the resemblance accidental? there remain the further questions, (1) Does the resemblance point to identity of authorship or to literary dependence? and (2) If to the latter, which document is dependent on the other? The answer to this last question is always one

of peculiar delicacy, though even here there are degrees of difficulty, and excessive distrust of this line of argument is as much to be deplored as are undue haste and confidence.

The history of criticism affecting the relation of these two productions is worthy of note for two reasons: first, because it exhibits every variety of opinion on the subject defended by some critic; and second, because it marks the successive steps in a progression from views least favorable, toward those most favorable, to the traditional date and authorship of the Priests' Code.

The resemblances between Ezekiel and the Priests' Code are so striking, numerous and pervasive, that after Graf had suggested a late origin for P, the first opinion to find defenders was the identification-theory. Several critics, including Graf himself, maintained Ezekiel's authorship of the Priests's Code. This is of course the easiest and most natural explanation of the many points of contact between them, and it is not strange that it should have found adherents. The difficulty with it, however, is so obvious, that we are not surprised to find that after Klostermann thirty years ago had once pointed out the inexplicable differences between Ezekiel and the author of P, the identification-theory was quite abandoned. This same critic, whose independent reasoning thus turned the tide, was also the first to set forth clearly the characteristics of that group of chapters in Leviticus (xvii-xxvi), which since his time has been called the "Law of Holiness" (H). It is in this section of the Priests's Code that its resemblance to Ezekiel culminates, and it is therefore natural to find the discussion of their mutual relationship thenceforth taking the form of comparisons between Ezekiel on the one hand and this "Holiness-Code" on the other. Wellhausen and Kuenen, approaching the subject from the standpoint of the Pentateuch, and Smend, approaching it from the standpoint of Ezekiel, argued the priority of Ezekiel to the Law of Holiness, and *à fortiori* to P in general; while Horst analyzed

the Law of Holiness into a code and its redactor, identifying the latter with Ezekiel.

Though critics like Delitzsch, Dillmann, Klostermann and others steadily maintained the priority of P to Ezekiel, the school that followed the lead of Wellhausen have during the past twenty-five years regarded the reverse order as proved from those general historical considerations that lie at the basis of their reconstructed history of Israel. Their attitude towards literary difficulties arising from a comparison of Ezekiel with the supposedly earliest stratum of P, the Holiness-Code, may be illustrated by a remark of Kuenen. The author of H, he says, "follows the older tradition", in a matter where Ezekiel is clearly the more highly developed and therefore on his principles should be the later. This apparently innocent remark, that H "follows the older tradition", is worthy of note, because its real significance is the surrender of comparison with the prophets as a sure method of dating the law.

The work of Klostermann and Horst bore fruit at last in the confession of Baentsch (1893), then an adherent of the Wellhausen school, that the detailed comparison of H with Ezekiel requires the priority of H in its characteristic nucleus.¹ Only its minute analysis into a bewildering array of codes and redactions permits Baentsch to preserve for H as a finished product that dependence on Ezekiel which is a cardinal doctrine of the adherents of Wellhausen. It remained only for Paton (1896) to restate the arguments of Klostermann in the light of Baentsch's analysis of H, to prove the fallacy of Baentsch's reasoning wherever he made Ezekiel earlier than H.² In this verdict Paton has been

¹ B. Baentsch, *Das Heiligkeitsgesetz*, Erfurt 1893. Baentsch in his recent work, *Altorientalischer und israelitischer Monotheismus* (Tübingen 1906) has definitely broken with the Wellhausen school.

² Article in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, 1896, pp. 98-115, entitled "The Holiness-Code and Ezekiel". Dr. Driver, in his *Introduction*, p. 147, footnote, refers to this as "the excellent article of L. B. Paton".

followed by Driver and such others as are open to conviction by the arguments of literary criticism.

The present state of opinion, therefore, regarding the literary relation between Ezekiel and the Law of Holiness is that there is no identity of authorship or redaction, that there is genuine literary dependence, and that this dependence is on the part of Ezekiel, not of the author or authors of H. So far as it goes, this historical movement of criticism is, as already remarked, favorable to the traditional date and authorship of P. But the only part of P concerned is that earliest stratum called the Law of Holiness. Clearly there is no sign here of a reversal of opinion regarding the rest of the Priests' Code. Its earliest stratum may indeed be earlier than Ezekiel; H, instead of Ezekiel, may represent the earliest stage in that evolutionary movement that led from the Deuteronomic Code to the finished Priests' Code. But in all this there is nothing to prove that the later strata of P are earlier than Ezekiel.

It would be apart from the present purpose to enlarge this historical sketch by a review of the discussions regarding the extent of the Holiness-Code, and the kindred subject, the extent of the earliest strata of P. It is sufficient to remark that considerable sections of P outside of Lev. xvii-xxvi have been sundered out of the Priests' Code as a whole, and either connected with H (Wurster, Cornill, Wildeboer), or put in a group apart, as isolated (or perhaps related) fragments of pre-exilic laws (Baentsch, Oxford Hexateuch). The climax is reached when, both from antecedent probability and especially from the consideration of Exodus vi. 6-8, Driver concludes that this early stratum of P "was prefaced by a short historical introduction, setting forth its origin and scope".

The particular bearing of these admissions upon the comparison of Ezekiel with the Priests' Code in general appears, when Driver shows the consequence of the admissions to be the complete dissolution of the entity represented by the symbol P. "There are other parts", he writes, "as well as

those including the Law of Holiness, which, when examined closely, seem to consist of *strata*, exhibiting side by side the usage of different periods. The stereotyped terminology may (to a certain extent) be the characteristic, not of an individual, but of the priestly style generally." "The phraseology of P, it is natural to suppose", he continues, "is one which had gradually formed; hence it contains elements which are no doubt ancient side by side with those which were introduced later. The priests of each successive generation would adopt, as a matter of course, the technical formulæ, and other stereotyped expressions, which they learnt from their seniors, new terms, when they were introduced, being accommodated to the old moulds. Hence, no doubt", concludes Dr. Driver, "the similarity of Ezekiel's style to P, even when a definite law is not quoted by him: although, from the greater variety of subjects which he deals with as a prophet, the vocabulary of P is not sufficient for him, he still frequently uses expressions belonging to the priestly terminology, with which he was familiar."³

If these modified views are those with which we have to deal, as the later, more cautious and apologetic representative of Wellhausenism, it is plain that, in order to test the hypothesis by the book of Ezekiel, it will not be sufficient to compare P and Ezekiel along broad and general lines merely. This too is useful. For it serves to strengthen the impression already made by Driver's words last quoted,—the impression of Ezekiel as an individual standing near the end of a long series of literary development, and dependent upon what is prior to him for what he has in common with the series. But this is not enough. All is in flux. If it is possible to get down to details, to fix upon definite passages or usages, and ask, In this representative detail, and this, and this, is Ezekiel the dependent mind or the creative?

³ Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 151, 154, 156f. In the *Oxford Hexateuch* the analysis is effected, within the limits of the symbol P, into four strata. Mr. Harford, the author of these analytical tables, remarks, p. 427, "It is both safe and sufficient to follow the lines implied by the symbols . . . P^a P^c P^g P^m".

then there is something visible, tangible, concrete, on which to build an edifice of solid opinion concerning this elusive question of the Priests' Code.

If there can be found in Ezekiel a point of contact with some portion of the Priests' Code alleged to belong to its later strata; if this point of contact is of a representative nature, that is, differs in no respect from the thousand other points of contact between Ezekiel and the various Pentateuchal documents; and if it appears clearly that here also Ezekiel is the dependent,—there follows as the inevitable result a conviction that this Priests' Code too is pre-exilic; that in spite of all Wellhausen's arguments from the supposed course of evolution in Israel, and in spite of all Driver's chemical reagents of "strata", "schools", and "stereotyped formulae," the Priests' Code is the product of an earlier age than Ezekiel. It is to three such tests in detail, specific yet representative of the many similar points of contact from which these have been selected, that attention is now directed.

I. When a land is threatened by a prophet with the utmost visitation of divine wrath, there is in the situation itself a resemblance to the deluge that would make an allusion thereto quite natural. Ezekiel more than once addresses himself to the land of Israel, and once when he does so he expressly mentions Noah (xiv. 14, 20). It should therefore be no cause of surprise when, in chapter vii, in his most elaborate address to the land of Israel, we find verbal affinity with the deluge-story. Although the text of this seventh chapter affords some perplexities, there is no textual critic whose proposed emendations, however radical, remove from it these unmistakable literary relationships with the narrative of the flood. Thus, the "violence" mentioned in ver. 11 is echoed in ver. 23 in the parallelism, "For the land is full of judgment for blood, and the city is full of violence";⁴ and in ver. 17 of the following chapter,

⁴In quoting the Old Testament the text of the Revised Version is used; departures from it are always in the interest of greater literalness.

“For they have filled the land with violence”; and in ver. 9 of the next chapter, “And the land is full of violence”.⁵ To this corresponds the reason assigned for the deluge, Gen. vi. 13, “For the earth is full of violence”.⁶ But in this same verse in Genesis, that effect for which this moral fact is assigned as the cause, is worded thus: “The end of all flesh has come before me.” When now we turn back to Ezekiel vii and find the prophet’s message to the land beginning (ver. 2) with these words, “An end: the end is come upon the four corners of the land.”⁷ Now is the end upon thee”, and reiterating in ver. 6, where the prophet makes a fresh beginning, “An end is come, the end is come”, these two convictions are forced upon us: first, that a mere chance resemblance of the two passages is an untenable position; and second, that it is Ezekiel, not the author of the flood-narrative, who is the dependent mind.

We have here, in fact, a situation similar to that which Paton has so well exhibited in the mutual relationship of Ezekiel xx and Leviticus xviii. 1-5. In Ezek. xx it is evident that the prophet has in his own mind, and presupposes as present in his hearer’s minds, those succinct injunctions regarding Egyptian and Canaanitish forms of idolatry which are recorded in Lev. xviii. 1-5 and are assigned by the documentary analysis to H. Out of this brief hortatory section of H, less than 50 words in length, Ezekiel makes an extended homily of over 700 words. In the case of Ezek. vii compared with the deluge-story we have, not indeed a homily on a Pentateuchal text, but the kindred phenomenon (already recognized and formulated by critics of Ezekiel) of *the recurrent emergence of a favorite borrowed phrase first seized and cherished because of its appeal to a true sense of analogy.*

What now is the document to which these expressions

⁵ So Baer’s text, instead of דמים “blood” in the common editions.

⁶ The English reader should note that “land” and “earth” render the same Hebrew word, so that the verbal correspondence is complete.

⁷ Note the change from ארצה in ver. 2a to ארץ in ver. 2b.

in the deluge-story are assigned, when that story is divided between J and P? On the basis of the Wellhausen hypothesis we should confidently expect to find that J was the author. But in fact Gen. vi. 13, "The end of all flesh has come before me, for the earth is filled with violence," is unanimously assigned to P. But, to what stratum of P? we must ask at once, in the face of that dissolution of the symbol P which, as we have seen, is the latest phase of Pentateuchal criticism.

The Genesis-narratives of priestly origin are for the Wellhausen school an integral part of the Priests' Code as a whole. Graf, the first to put the legislation of P after the exile, left these P-portions of Genesis, where earlier criticism had placed them, in the pre-exilic period. But after Kuenen had demonstrated that P-history and P-laws belong together and cannot be thus separated, Graf himself was convinced, and his followers have ever since maintained this view as a necessary corollary of their principles of legal evolution. Nor do they place the historical narratives among the earliest strata of P. Beyond the slight concession of Driver, noted above, that in the light of Ex. vi. 6-8 the earliest stratum of P may have "been prefaced by a short historical introduction", nothing has developed in the way of a movement in this direction.⁸ Even Driver's words mean little in this regard, and on the contrary direct assertions of a late origin for the P of Genesis (Wellhausen's Q) are everywhere to be found.

Our conviction that the P-narrative of the flood is prior to Ezekiel, once gained, is deepened by observing that the hypothesis of an underlying sense of analogy in Ezekiel

⁸ Compare the naïve remark of Carpenter, *Composition of the Hexateuch*, p. 273: "It seems safer to confine P^b [= H] to a collection of laws and exhortations in the wilderness independent of any lengthy historical recital." This "safe" verdict concludes a discussion of the bounds of H, in the course of which it is granted that if the usual criteria for detecting H are permitted to determine its bounds, "it must have contained historical as well as legislative matter on an extensive scale".

between the contemporary situation in sinful Israel and the moral conditions at the time of the flood accounts for (1) turns of thought otherwise obscure, and (2) the recurrence of expressions prominent in the flood-narrative.

(1) To the first of these two categories belongs that little clause in chap. vii, consisting of the last three words of ver. 11, which has furnished so much difficulty for commentators of Ezekiel. Smend, Cornill, Bertholet, Kraetzschmar and Jahn, all give up the attempt to interpret these words $\text{וְלֹא־נִהְיָה־בָּהֶם}$ which appear in our English Version as "Neither shall there be eminency among them", (margin, "wailing for them"). Yet they become the most natural expression in the world, if we suppose that Ezekiel had in his mind this underlying sense of analogy with the deluge-period, and remarked (compare xiv. 14, 20) that "there is no Noah among them", that is, among this "multitude" of "proud" and "violent" sinners in Israel, whose "time is come" and whose "day draweth near." Nothing could better express the completeness with which the impending doom is to sweep away "all the multitude thereof", without even one exception. And this too, whether we accept the reading וְנִ preserved in eight Hebrew MSS and in the Syriac Version, or whether we prefer the reading וְנִ vouched for by all other authorities. For in the latter case the play upon the name Noah would be striking, no matter which of the several interpretations of this obscure word we adopt; and on this view the reading of the name Noah would have arisen through an all-too-literal abandonment of Ezekiel's paronomasia.

If any further evidence were desired to show Ezekiel's underlying analogical thought, it might be found in a comparison of the next two verses, the 12th and 13th, with what Christ says when he, like Ezekiel, compares the coming of Jehovah's day with the coming of the deluge. (Luke xvii. 26-29). "And as it came to pass in the days of Noah, even so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They ate, they drank, they married, they were given in marriage, until

the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. Likewise even as it came to pass in the days of Lot; they ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but in the day that Lot went out from Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all." So Ezekiel says: "The time is come, the day draweth near: let not the buyer rejoice, nor the seller mourn: for wrath is upon all the multitude thereof. For the seller shall not return to that which is sold, although they be yet alive: for the vision is touching the whole multitude thereof, none shall return".⁹ (Ezek. vii. 12, 13).

(2) The second of those two classes of phenomena in Ezekiel, for which the hypothesis of an underlying feeling of analogy between his own times and the days of Noah best accounts, is the constant recurrence in Ezekiel of expressions prominent in the flood-narrative. There are about fifteen such expressions, several of them occurring from two to ten times, and with few exceptions these are expressions that in the story of the flood occur in P.¹⁰ Some of these deserve mention.

In the third and thirty-third chapters, in Ezekiel's familiar allegory of the watchman, Jehovah says of the man who perishes unwarned, "His blood will I require at the watchman's hand." It is not hard to choose between the alternatives afforded here. Did Ezekiel twice make use, in his repeated allegory, of a divine constitution embodied in the deluge-story, Gen. ix. 5 (P), "Your blood, even your lives, will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it; and at the hand of man, even at the hand of every man's brother, will I require the life of man"? Or did some later

⁹ Margin, "it shall not turn back".

¹⁰ One of the J-expressions is רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ "sweet savour", but as Gen. viii. is the only place where it is assigned to J, and as it occurs 38 times in P, it is of no value for the present discussion. Another word is טָרֵף "fresh", of foliage; this occurs only in Gen. viii. and Ezek. xvii. A third phrase is "cover one's nakedness", which besides Gen. ix. and Ezek. xvi. occurs only in Hos. ii.

author, in composing the Genesis-narrative, formulate his law of divine inquisition for shed blood in the very language of Ezekiel's allegory? Here again the natural choice is rendered more certain from the fact that the immediate context of this verse in Genesis furnishes other material for Ezekiel's repertoire of favorite phrases. The following verse, Gen. ix. 6, has the participial phrase "shedder of blood", which we find four times in Ezekiel¹¹ and nowhere else in the Old Testament.¹² And in the two preceding verses, (vv. 3, 4), Jehovah assigns food to man with the use of the phrase לֶאֱכֹל "for food", that occurs ten times in Ezekiel, who is particularly fond of this idea of the assignment of something or other as food to man or beast, exactly in the tone and language of the creation- and flood-narratives of P.

Again, in the theophany of Ezekiel's opening chapter, the divine glory is compared to the rainbow in these words, "Like the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain." (Ezek. i. 28). This is the only reference in the Old Testament to the rainbow, except that in Gen. ix. 14 (P). Now whether or not the rainbow-episode was an integral part of the deluge-story in its common Semitic form, it remains true (1) that the rainbow-episode in the Hebrew narrative belongs to P only; (2) that the rainbow is introduced in P as the center of the story, and in Ezekiel only as an object of comparison; and (3) that the wording of the two passages is identical not only in the name of the bow הַקֶּשֶׁת בְּעֶנָן: "the bow in the cloud," but even in the expression accompanying this name,—in Genesis, "it shall be seen", "shall appear", נִרְאָה, in Ezekiel a noun from the same verb, "the appearance of", מְרֵאָה. If it is natural to believe that these two passages, the only ones referring to the rainbow, and so similar in diction, are not independent of each other, it is equally natural to believe that Ezekiel, for the purposes of his comparison, used language familiar to

¹¹ Ezek. xvi. 38, xviii. 10, xxii. 3, xxiii. 45.

¹² Not even Prov. vi. 17.

him from the deluge-story, and it is more than equally difficult to believe that conversely P in framing his rainbow-episode was influenced in his wording of it by the reminiscence of this almost chance comparison in Ezekiel's theophany.

References to various orders and classes of animal life, which P in the creation- and flood-narratives has in common with Ezekiel, might be explained upon Driver's principle of inherited priestly functions and terminology, such for example as "creeping thing" רמש, "after its kind" למינה, "to swarm" שרץ. But is it reasonable to explain in this manner such remarkable collocations of words as these?—"every fowl of every wing" כל צפור כל כנף, which occurs thrice in Ezekiel¹³ and but once besides in the Old Testament,¹⁴ viz. in Gen. vii. 14 (P); "the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the heaven, and the beasts of the field, and all creeping things that creep upon the earth, and all the men that are upon the face of the earth" (Ezek. xxxviii. 20), a catalogue too familiar in the creation- and flood-narratives to need detailed comparison. Here again the question is worth weighing: is it more reasonable to explain this apparent literary dependence by assuming that the author of P worded his catalogues of the animal kingdom under the influence of Ezekiel's description of Jehovah's "shaking" of the land by means of God's army; or by assuming that, when Ezekiel wanted to particularize, in his word-painting of this great vision, he should consciously or unconsciously dip his brush in the familiar pigments of the creation-story and the deluge-story? Between these alternatives it seems not hard to choose, quite apart from the general psychological consideration that Ezekiel is admittedly the quoter *par excellence* among all the Old Testament prophets.

Before leaving this first detail of our comparison it seems desirable to make these two observations. (1) The priority of P is to be regarded as proved by Ezekiel's use of Gen.

¹³ Ezek. xvii. 23, xxxix. 4, 17.

¹⁴ Deut. iv. 17 and Ps. cxlviii. 10 lack the כל between the two nouns.

vi. 13 in his seventh chapter, and this proof, if valid, as confirmed by each added consideration and cumulatively confirmed by all taken collectively. And (2), the same kind and degree of correspondences with P in the Psalms are uniformly held by critics of this Wellhausen school to prove the lateness of the Psalm, *i. e.*, the priority of P. Witness, for example, the eighth Psalm, with its echoes of the creation-narrative.

II. The second of the details selected for this test of literary priority is to be found in the great theophanies of Ezekiel. The inaugural vision of chapters i-iii is repeated in chap. x in identical diction and phraseology. However obscure may be the meaning of portions of this detailed imagery, one thing is clear above all else, that the prophet is laboring to clothe in words the deepest impression made on his soul by the theophany. If Jehovah appeared to Isaiah supremely as the Holy One, and to Jeremiah supremely as the Almighty One, He awoke in Ezekiel supremely the sense of His glory. We feel as we read his record that he is seeking to emphasize in every possible way the indescribable glory of the divine Person who has appeared to him.

Now in his conscious or unconscious search for phrases, for the literary form in which to mold his description, there is no point of attachment to previous experience in Israel more natural than that supreme theophany, when Jehovah appeared at Sinai, at the founding of the nation which now to Ezekiel he seemed to have cast off. There too, as here, it was the overpowering glory of God that was most dwelt upon by its narrators. Hence it is no surprise to find in Ezekiel's description the same phenomena as are found in the JE-account of the divine apparition at Sinai. So *e. g.*, "the torches" הלפרים Ezek. i. 13, Ex. xx. 18 (E), the "lightning" ברק Ezek. i. 13, Ex. xix. 16 (E), the "sapphire" ספיר Ezek. i. 26, Ex. xxiv. 10 (J), and the word translated "work" מעשה Ezek. i. 16, Ex. xxiv. 10 (J).

There is nothing surprising in all this, and it is acceptable to all parties.

But in referring to this theophany in chap. viii, ver. 4, and again in chap. ix, ver. 3, and three times besides, Ezekiel uses a phrase which takes up elements of diction from both halves of Exodus, chap. xxiv. That chapter is always divided between J and P, the first eleven verses being assigned to J, and vv. 12-17 to P. In the 10th verse (the same in which the "sapphire" is mentioned), which belongs to the J-document, we read, "They saw the God of Israel". And in the 17th verse, which belongs to P, we read, "And the appearance of the glory of Jehovah was like devouring fire", etc.¹⁵ Now Ezekiel's standing phrase, whenever he wishes to refer succinctly to the whole divine apparition already so lengthily described, is "the glory of the God of Israel". And in chap. viii, ver. 4, we have this phrase associated with the same word "appearance" מראה, which occurs in conjunction with "the glory of Jehovah" in Ex. xxiv. 17 (P). "The glory of the God of Israel, like the appearance which I saw," etc.—this entire phrase of Ezekiel is therefore made up of elements from the J-portion of Ex. xxiv enclosed between elements from the P-portion of the same chapter.¹⁶ As surely as the admitted priority of J vouches for Ezekiel's dependence in this phrase-building on the Sinai-narratives, so surely does it draw with it the conclusion that these Sinai-narratives, as known to Ezekiel, already embodied material assigned to P.

Of this portion of the Priests' Code it is sufficient to say what has already been said in the case of the foregoing test, that it is in no way exceptional, and that it has never been put forward, in the way in which other parts of P in Exodus have been, as a part of an earlier stratum of P.

¹⁵ Similarly, ver. 16 (P).

¹⁶ The phrase "God of Israel", though it occurs numberless times in the Old Testament, is used as a supplementary title to some divine name preceding it, except in these passages in Exodus and Ezekiel, and twenty-five times besides. But in none of these other twenty-five occurrences is it connected in any way with the thought of a theophany.

III. We pass now to a third representative detail, to continue this literary test. One of the symbolic actions required of Ezekiel in the inauguration of his prophetic ministry to Israel (chap. iv), is that he should lie first upon one side, then upon the other, a fixed number of days, thus symbolically to "bear the iniquity" of the "house of Israel" and of the "house of Judah" respectively. Let it be noted at the outset that there is uncertainty with respect to two matters in this passage: first, the text, where the true number of days on the left side for the house of Israel is disputed; and second, the interpretation, where there is diversity of opinion as to the significance of these numbers. These uncertainties, however, do not affect in the slightest degree the following argument. For, whatever be the prophet's intention in the selection of the symbolical numbers, this at least is universally acknowledged, that the principle of selection was that formally stated in the 6th verse, *יום לשנה יום לשנה* a day for its year a day for its year, or as in our version, "each day for a year".

There is but one other place in the Old Testament where this principle, so often applied in the symbolism of the Bible, is thus expressly stated. This is Num. xiv. 34, in the narrative of the spying of the land of Canaan while Israel was in the wilderness of Paran. There we read that Jehovah punished Israel, with the exception of the two believing spies, by condemning the nation to wander in the wilderness forty years. And the choice of this number is thus explained: "After the number of days in which ye spied out the land, even forty days, a day for its year a day for its year, shall ye bear your iniquities, even forty years." This verse belongs to the document P by common consent. When now we turn back to Ezekiel, we find that the resemblance of his language to this verse in Numbers is not confined to the phrase above mentioned, but extends to every element of the verse. If P has, "After the number of the days in which ye spied out the land", Ezekiel has, "According to the number of the days that thou shalt lie upon it" (ver. 4),

and again, "According to the number of days" (ver. 5). If P has, "Forty days, a day for its year a day for its year", Ezekiel has word for word the same (ver. 6), and in the same order. And finally, if P has, "Shall ye bear your iniquities", Ezekiel has, "Thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah" (ver. 6).

Here there is obviously no room to question literary dependence of the most pronounced kind. This is admitted by all parties. Smend, for example, includes these passages in his list of the points of contact between P and Ezekiel. The sole question, therefore, is, which document is dependent on the other?

We have here an apparent case of inconsistency among the adherents of the school of Wellhausen. Pentateuchal criticism is for once either lost sight of, or ignored, when the critic becomes the commentator. In the two latest commentaries on Ezekiel by followers of Graf and Wellhausen, those of Bertholet (1897) and Kraetzschmar (1900), it is naïvely allowed that Num. xiv. 34 exerted an influence upon Ezekiel in this passage. Bertholet (p. 25) says: "It is also possible that Ezekiel had in mind an analogy with the forty-year punishment of the wilderness, Num. xiv. 34." And Kraetzschmar (p. 48), in explaining how Ezekiel came to fix upon forty years as the duration of Judah's punishment, remarks that this number "has its analogies in the forty years of the wandering in the wilderness, Num. xiv. 34, and in the forty days of Ezekiel's journey through the wilderness to the mount of God, 1 Ki. xix. 8"; by the collocation of these two examples Kraetzschmar clearly leaves the impression that the former, as well as the latter, is prior to Ezekiel and thus could influence his mind.

But after all the matter of real concern is not what this or that man thinks about the relative priority of Num. xiv. 34 and Ezek. iv. 4-6, but rather what these two passages themselves testify to us of their mutual relationship. And here there are two points of view for our comparison, ac-

ording as we approach it from the side of contents or from that of form.

From the former point of view, the comparison of contents, these alternatives emerge: which is the more natural, that the author of the P-narrative of the wanderings should fix upon forty days for the spying of the land, and then connect this period symbolically with the traditional¹⁷ forty years of the wanderings,—all in imitation of Ezekiel's symbolic action of lying on his side forty days to bear the iniquity of the house of Judah, a day for a year; or that Ezekiel should, as Ewald long ago pointed out, have constructed his whole symbolic action of a penal "bearing of iniquity" for Judah during forty days, out of the suggestive material afforded him in this well-known wilderness episode, the penal character of which was brought out in just this verse in connection with an arithmetical symbolism?

Our immediate judgment in favor of the latter alternative is the more confirmed, the more closely we examine the consequences of adopting the one or the other. For if we were to adopt the former, that is, the view that Ezekiel here was prior to P, it would involve us in the absurdity of attributing to P not merely invention of historical facts—this is an essential part of the Wellhausen conception of P—and not merely a dependence on Ezekiel wholly uncalled-for under the circumstances of this case, but this invention and this slavish dependence without any assignable motive. Who will attempt the psychological riddle of such an author? And again, if we adopt the latter of the two alternatives presented above, and allow Num. xiv. 34 the priority, we at once find confirmation of our judgment in two ways: first, by observing, what no one disputes, that for Ezekiel and his hearers the wilderness-period of their nation's history held the foremost place of interest, owing to a real

¹⁷ Compare Num. xiv. 33 (JE according to Driver, Kautzsch, Strack, etc., P according to Oxf. Hex.); Amos v. 25 (though Marti excises "forty years" he allows that Amos knew this traditional number).

analogy in the situation of the exiles;¹⁸ and second, by noting that, as might be expected, Ezekiel elsewhere makes use of expressions common to him and to the story in Numbers. For example, in Num. xiii. 32 Canaan is described by the spies as a land that is a “devourer of her inhabitants”; and in Ezek. xxxvi. 13 we find the prophet addressing the same land as a “devourer of men”.¹⁹ And the divine designation of the murmuring Israelites in the incident of Num. xvii (P) as בְּנֵי קָרִי “children of rebellion” is echoed in Ezekiel’s favorite phrase for Israel, בֵּית קָרִי “house of rebellion”, which he uses twelve times.

When now we approach the comparison of these two passages, Num. xiv. 34 and Ezek. iv. 4-6, from the formal side, we observe the same phenomenon in this case as in the case of the deluge-narrative: that what in P is said once, and compactly, is in Ezekiel, (1) so divided as that elements of it appear in three consecutive verses (vv. 4-6); (2) repeated, *e. g.*, “number of days” twice, “bear the iniquity of” thrice; (3) varied, *e. g.*, “according to the number of days” is in ver. 4 מִכְּפָר הַיָּמִים without the preposition and with the article, in ver. 5 לְמִכְּפָר יָמִים with the preposition and without the article, and the passive idea of “bearing” iniquity is paralleled by the active notion of “putting” iniquity on one for him to bear, while even this modification is expressed now by the verb שָׂם (ver. 4) and now by the verb נָתַן (vv. 5, 6). But these phenomena, division, repetition and variation are the recognized characteristics of the quoter, whilst simplicity and compactness are marks of the original mind.

Whether, therefore, we compare Num. xiv. 34 and Ezek. iv. 4-6 with respect to form or to contents, the same conclusion is necessary, that P is earlier than Ezekiel. Here then we have a third section of P, in no way exceptional, and never suggested by any critic as belonging to the earlier

¹⁸ See especially Klostermann, in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1897, “Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs”, 7, pp. 353-383.

¹⁹ Note the participial form in each case, and contrast Lev. xxvi. 38, which besides is not said of Canaan.

strata of that hypothetical document, which proves itself, upon comparison with Ezekiel, to be pre-exilic.

Comparison of these three tests reveals the interesting fact that they are representative in a large way, being drawn, the first from the earliest, the second from the middle, and the third from the latest portion of the P-narrative of the Pentateuch.

If query be raised, why all three should be from the historical, and none from the bulky legal sections of the Priests' Code, it is sufficient to remind the inquirer that Dr. Driver's modified statement of the Wellhausen view of P, as given in his own words in the introduction to this investigation, challenges our right to use any word, phrase, institution or idea concerned with priesthood, sanctuary and ritual, to prove that P was pre-exilic. But these of course are just the subjects that make up the legal portions of the Priests' Code. Hence in the selection of representative tests from the mass of available material, one of the prevailing principles has been to choose points of contact as far as possible removed from Ezekiel's priestly functions and interests. And surely, references to his inaugural vision as a prophet, the description of a symbolic action performed in his prophetic character, and a prophetic address to the land of Israel, are three parts of his book which would be adjudged by all to be as free as possible from infection with distinctively priestly ideas or phraseology.

It should also be remarked that the student who is interested in this subject of the points of contact between Ezekiel and the Priests' Code will find, first, that there is considerable material ready for investigation along the same lines as those here followed; and second, that he will not be perplexed by irreconcilable results, for wherever a clear case of literary affinity is discerned and there are sufficient criteria to determine relative priority, the result will always be the same. Instead of finding that new tests contradict those here discussed, he will discover that each new test will

add fresh weight to the conviction we have here attained, that the Priests' Code is pre-exilic in its alleged later strata as well as in its earlier ones.

In the light of these results, many may find the question shaping itself in their minds, what can be said in answer to all this? Is there any way to escape the conclusion while not denying the incontrovertible facts?

There is one way to admit these facts and still believe in the Wellhausen dictum that P is later than Ezekiel. As it is not merely a theoretical way of escape, but has actually been resorted to by the latest commentator on Ezekiel, G. Jahn (1905), it will be best to let him state it in his own words. "Expressions from the Priests' Code and the Law of Holiness . . . are interpolated [into the text of Ezekiel], in order to make these writings appear prior to Ezekiel. This work of the Sopherim, like so many other forgeries, succeeded so well that to the present day commentators, both orthodox and liberal, such as Hengstenberg, Dillmann, Vatke, Nöldeke, conclude from these expressions that Ezekiel was acquainted with P. . . . The fact that P was interpolated in Ezekiel and Ezekiel thus appeared younger, was probably a leading motive for the admission of Ezekiel into the canon, that is, as a bulwark for P."²⁰

It is unnecessary to make any comments upon this assertion, beyond the simple remark that it admits the validity of our result: Ezekiel, as it stands, proves the priority of P. No one could be better satisfied to see this line of reasoning urged, than the critic who believes in the antiquity of the Priests' Code, for it gives the finishing touch to his own arguments by furnishing a gratuitous *reductio ad absurdum* of the contrary opinion.

In conclusion there is something to be said of the state of the question as our argument leaves it.

On the one hand it is clear that nothing is decided as between the views of such representative scholars as Dillmann and Green. To determine whether P is Mosaic, or

²⁰ *Ezekiel*, preface, p. ix.

merely pre-exilic with a very ancient nucleus, other witnesses than Ezekiel have to be called and other lines of reasoning pursued.

And on the other hand it is equally clear that the great step from Wellhausen's position to the result we have reached *has already been taken*, when (to use Kuenen's symbol) a P¹ has been sundered out of the Priests' Code in general and assigned, even in part, to the pre-exilic age. This earliest stratum, P¹, of undetermined size, starting with the little \pm H¹ of Baentsch, growing under Horst's treatment into the code of H, expanding in Paton into all H, and looming up in Driver and others as a vague but comprehensive bulk, proves in the event to be fatal to that concise, attractive theory of Wellhausen, which had at least the merit of self-consistency and knew where to draw its own sharp lines. Kuenen allowed room for strata in P but never consented to put even his P¹, his earliest stratum, before Ezekiel. He apparently saw well the ultimate outcome of such an admission. How he got over the difficulties of comparison with Ezekiel, we have already seen in our introductory section. What we have done is in fact, in the light of the historical movement there traced, simply to take the next step, the step logically demanded; and this too by an extension of the same method which determined the earlier steps, the method of detailed literary comparison. It is still possible, of course, for a critic to sunder out of P as a whole this section or that, and to say of it, this is post-exilic, it belongs to a late supplemental stratum of P. But in doing so, the burden of proof will rest on him who asserts, not on him who denies, this exceptional lateness of (shall we say?) a golden altar, or a day of atonement.

Though little of the great mass contained in the Priests' Code can, from the nature of the case, receive direct confirmation from Ezekiel; though, on Jahn's interpolation-theory, the Scribes did their work so badly that but a small proportion of the laws and stories of P find the "bulwark" of their antiquity in Ezekiel; still, the discovery that when-

ever the test of comparison can be fairly applied, the Priests' Code stands the test, produces the conviction in every candid mind that it does not just happen so in these chance cases, but that by and large, from Genesis to Numbers, the Priests' Code finds its confirmation as a pre-exilic document from the way it stands comparison with the points of contact in the book of Ezekiel.

Princeton.

J. OSCAR BOYD.