

Hebrew Bible / Old Testament
The History of Its Interpretation

Edited by
Magne Sæbø

VOLUME III
From Modernism to Post-Modernism
(The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries)

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Hebrew Bible / Old Testament The History of Its Interpretation

VOLUME III
From Modernism to Post-Modernism
(The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries)

In Co-operation with
Peter Machinist and Jean Louis Ska, SJ

Edited by
Magne Sæbø

PART 1
The Nineteenth Century –
a Century of Modernism and Historicism

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Contents

Preface	15
1. Fascination with 'History' – Biblical Interpretation in a Century of Modernism and Historicism By MAGNE SÆBØ, Oslo	17
1. Roots of Historical Thinking and Historicism	21
2. Growth and Impact of New Historical Evidence	23
3. The Challenge of the Historicism	25

A. The General Cultural Context of Nineteenth Century's Biblical Interpretation

2. Historical, Cultural and Philosophical Aspects of the Nineteenth Century with Special Regard to Biblical Interpretation By JAN RÖHLS, Munich	31
1. Aspects of the Enlightenment's Cultural and Philosophical Legacy	31
2. F.D.E. Schleiermacher – His Criticism of the Old Testament	38
3. G.F.W. Hegel – the Impact of His Philosophy on Old Testament Studies	45
4. Old Testament Studies and Protestant Theology at German Universities	52
3. The Phenomenon of 'Historicism' as a Backcloth of Biblical Scholarship By GUNTER SCHOLTZ, Bochum	64
1. The Rise of Historical Consciousness and the Term 'Historicism'	66
2. The Way of Historicism in the Nineteenth Century	73
3. Historicism in Biblical Studies	80
4. Expansion of the Historical Context of the Hebrew Bible / Old Testament By STEVEN W. HOLLOWAY, Chicago	90
1. Introduction	94
2. The Bible in the Context of the Ancient Near East – the Significance of New Comparative Texts	95

3. The Historical Geography of the Holy Land 104
4. The Emergence of a so-called 'Biblical Archaeology' in Europe and North America 110
5. Expansion of the Anthropological, Sociological and Mythological Context of the Hebrew Bible / Old Testament
By J. W. ROGERSON, Sheffield 119
 1. Introduction 120
 2. Comparative Folkloristic Studies 121
 3. New Anthropological and Sociological Perspectives – the Case of William Robertson Smith and his Work 127
 4. New Mythological Studies 132
6. Expansion of the Linguistic Context of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: Hebrew Among the Languages of the Ancient Near East
By HOLGER GZELLA, Leiden 134
 1. Increasing Knowledge of the Semitic Languages 134
 2. Wilhelm Gesenius and the Development of Hebrew Studies 148
 3. Further Achievements in Hebrew Philology 156

*B. Main Regional and Confessional Areas
of the Nineteenth Century's Biblical Scholarship*

7. The 'New World' of North America and Canada – and the Globalization of Critical Biblical Scholarship
By JAMES P. BYRD, Nashville, TN 171
 1. Biblical Criticism in the Early Nineteenth Century: Common Sense and a Democratic Scripture 176
 - 1.1. American Biblical Criticism Conceived: Joseph Stevens Buckminster at Harvard 177
 - 1.2. The Beginnings of Old Testament Scholarship in America: Moses Stuart at Andover 177
 - 1.3. Edward Robinson and the Innovation of Biblical Archeology 180
 - 1.4. Unitarian Biblical Scholarship at Harvard 181
 2. Mid-Century Challenges to the American Bible 183
 - 2.1. Genesis and Geology in America: The Old Testament and the Challenges from New Science 183
 - 2.2. The Bible, Slavery, and the Civil War 185
 3. The Formation of an American Academy of Biblical Scholarship: Early Collaborative Efforts 187
 - 3.1. Biblical Commentary: The Lange Project 188
 - 3.2. Biblical Translation: The Revised Version 189

4.	The Old Testament and Higher Criticism in the United States and Canada, 1880–1900	190
4.1.	The Old Testament and the University: The Vision of William Rainey Harper	193
4.2.	The Protestant Heresy Trial in the United States: The Case of Charles Briggs	195
4.3.	Historical Criticism and American Catholicism	198
4.4.	Historical Criticism in Canada	200
5.	Conclusion	201
8.	Protestant Biblical Scholarship on the European Continent and in Great Britain and Ireland By J. W. ROGERSON, Sheffield	203
1.	The Political and Ecclesiastical Background	204
2.	The Continent of Europe from 1800 to 1860	205
3.	Great Britain and Ireland from 1800 to 1860	209
4.	The Continent of Europe 1860–1899	210
5.	Great Britain and Ireland 1860–1899	215
9.	Biblical Scholarship in Northern Europe By JESPER HØGENHAVEN, Copenhagen	223
1.	The Historical Background	224
2.	Bible Reading and Bible Promotion in the Nordic Countries	225
3.	Biblical Scholarship at the Nordic Universities	226
4.	From Historical “Biblicism” to Historical Criticism	229
4.1.	Historical “Biblicism” – a Conservative Synthesis	229
4.2.	Historical Criticism – a New Synthesis Emerging	232
5.	Two Internationally Renowned Biblical Scholars: C. P. Caspari and F. Buhl	234
5.1.	Carl Paul Caspari	234
5.2.	Frants Buhl	236
6.	Bible Interpretation in N. F. S. Grundtvig and S. Kierkegaard	240
6.1.	Nikolai Frederik Severin Grundtvig	240
6.2.	Søren Kierkegaard	242
10.	The Catholic Church and Historical Criticism of the Old Testament By GERALD P. FOGARTY, Charlottesville, VA	244
1.	Introduction	245
2.	The First Catholic Reaction to Historical Criticism	246
3.	The Catholic Attack on Modernism	252
4.	From Pius XII to Vatican II: The Catholic Embrace of Historical Criticism	257

11. Jewish Biblical Scholarship between Tradition and Innovation By EDWARD BREUER and CHANAN GAFNI, Jerusalem	262
1. Introduction	263
2. Approaches to Textual Criticism	266
3. On Authorship and Dating of Biblical Texts	278
4. Exegesis	292
5. Epilogue	302

*C. Special Fields and Different Approaches
in the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible / Old Testament*

12. The 'History of Israel': Its Emergence as an Independent Discipline By JEAN LOUIS SKA, Rome	307
1. Introduction: The Development of a Historical Methodology in the Seventeenth Century	307
2. Modern Studies of History in the Nineteenth Century	309
3. Biblical Chronology	313
3.1. Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609)	315
3.2. Denis Pétau (Dionysius Petavius) (1583–1652)	316
3.3. James Ussher (1581–1656)	317
4. The Emergence of an Independent History of Israel	319
4.1. Baruch Spinoza (1632–1677) and Richard Simon (1638–1712)	320
4.2. The Netherlands: Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) and Peter Cunaeus (1586–1638)	321
4.3. Great Britain and France: Moses Lowman (1679–1752); Bernard de Montfaucon (1655–1741); Humphrey Prideaux (1648–1724); Henry Hart Milman (1791–1868); Francis William Newman (1801–1890)	323
4.4. Germany: Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694–1798); Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803); Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette (1780–1849)	326
5. Georg Heinrich August Ewald (1803–1875)	329
5.1. The Purpose of Ewald's <i>History of Israel</i>	330
5.2. Ewald's Method	331
5.3. The Written Sources of a History of Israel	332
5.4. The Patriarchs in Ewald's <i>History of Israel</i>	335
5.5. Concluding Remarks	337
6. Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918)	337
7. The Other 'Histories of Israel'	341
13. 'Lower Criticism': Studies in the Masoretic Text and the Ancient Versions of the Old Testament as Means of Textual Criticism By RICHARD D. WEIS, Lexington, KY	346
1. Introduction	350

2. Abraham Geiger's <i>Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel</i> (1857)	. 351
3. Paul de Lagarde	. 358
4. Permutations: Nöldeke, Wellhausen and Cornill	. 362
5. Study of the Masoretic Text and Its Details (Masorah, Accents)	. 367
6. The Samaritan Pentateuch	. 372
7. Septuagint and Other Greek Versions	. 372
8. The Study of the Other Ancient Versions	. 377
9. Conclusions	. 379
10. Addendum: Development and Transformation of the Nineteenth Century's Legacy in the Twentieth	. 380
14. 'Higher Criticism': The Historical and Literary-critical Approach – with Special Reference to the Pentateuch	
By THOMAS RÖMER, Paris / Lausanne	. 393
1. W. M. L. de Wette	. 393
1.1. de Wette and Deuteronomy (1805)	. 395
1.2. de Wette and Vater	. 397
1.3. The Pentateuch as a Mythical Story of Origins	. 399
2. The Emergence of Theories about the Formation of the Pentateuch	. 400
2.1. Moses and the Pentateuch	. 400
2.2. Hexateuch instead of Pentateuch	. 406
2.3. Theories about the Evolution of Israel's Religious Ideas	. 407
2.4. The Three Main Models: Fragment Hypothesis, Supplementary Hypothesis and Documentary Hypothesis	. 410
3. Critical Investigation on the Formation of the Former and Latter Prophets	. 415
3.1. The Theory of Deuteronomistic Redactions in the Books of Joshua- Kings	. 415
3.2. Source and Redaction Criticism in the Latter Prophets	. 417
4. On the Way to Wellhausen: Reuss, Popper, Graf and the Invention of a Postmonarchic Priestly Document	. 420
15. The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen	
By RUDOLF SMEND, Göttingen	. 424
1. Introduction	. 424
2. Kuenen: Inquiry and History	. 426
2.1. Beginnings	. 427
2.2. <i>Historisch-kritisch onderzoek</i>	. 428
2.3. The Hexateuch	. 430
2.4. Prophecy	. 433
2.5. Religious History	. 434

3.	Wellhausen: Judaism and Ancient Israel	436
3.1.	The Early Works	438
3.2.	<i>Prolegomena to the History of Israel</i>	443
3.3.	<i>Israelite and Jewish History</i>	448
3.4.	Concerns and Criteria	450
16.	Albert Eichhorn and Hermann Gunkel: The Emergence of a History of Religion School By ERHARD S. GERSTENBERGER, Marburg	454
1.	Preludial	455
2.	University Spirit	456
3.	The Beginnings	456
4.	Interdisciplinary Work	458
5.	Focus on Jesus	459
6.	Christian Doctrine?	460
7.	Hebrew Scriptures	462
8.	Twentieth Century Developments	467
9.	Outlook	470
17.	In the Wake of Wellhausen: The Growth of a Literary-critical School and Its Varied Influence By RUDOLF SMEND, Göttingen	472
1.	Introduction	472
2.	Wellhausen as Literary Critic	474
3.	The Successors	476
3.1.	The Representative "Introductions"	476
3.2.	The ZAW	477
3.3.	First Variations	478
3.4.	Literary History	481
3.5.	<i>Geschichte des Volkes Israel</i>	482
3.6.	Commentaries	486
3.7.	Swan Songs	491
18.	A Conservative Approach in Opposition to a Historical-critical Interpretation: E. W. Hengstenberg and Franz Delitzsch By RUDOLF SMEND, Göttingen	494
1.	Introduction	494
2.	Hengstenberg	495
2.1.	Career and Church Politics	496
2.2.	The Old Testament	502
3.	Delitzsch	509
3.1.	Biography	510
3.2.	In Discussion	512

3.3. Judaism	516
3.4. Exegesis and Criticism	518
19. Studies on the Historical Books – Including Their Relationship to the Pentateuch	
By KARL WILLIAM WEYDE, Oslo	521
1. The Historical Books	523
2. Joshua – 2 Kings	525
2.1. Deuteronomy Re-Dated. Consequences for the Interpretation of the Historical Books: W. M. L. de Wette	526
2.2. Reactions to de Wette's Theory	527
2.3. A Postexilic Source in the Pentateuch and the Consequences for the Interpretation of the Historical Books. K. H. Graf	530
2.4. The Historical Books and the History of Israel. J. Wellhausen	532
2.5. Writing the History of Israel after Graf and Wellhausen	534
2.6. Joshua and its Literary Context: the Hexateuch Problem	535
2.7. Research towards the End of the Century	537
2.7.1. Scholars adopting the New Theories	537
2.7.2. Intermediary Critics	539
2.7.3. Researchers outside Germany	541
3. Chronicles	543
3.1. Questioning the Reliability. W. M. L. de Wette; K. H. Graf	543
3.2. The Chronicler's Source: " <i>ein spätes Machwerk</i> ". J. Wellhausen	546
3.3. Research towards the End of the Century	547
4. Ezra-Nehemiah	550
4.1. The Law in Ezra-Nehemiah	550
4.2. Sources, Date, Historical Reliability	551
20. Prophecy in the Nineteenth Century Reception	
By CHRISTOPHER R. SEITZ, Toronto	556
1. Introduction	558
2. Prophets and Law	561
3. Prophets in Order	564
4. Isaiah	570
5. Jeremiah and Ezekiel	574
6. Daniel	578
7. Conclusion	580
21. Studies of the Psalms and Other Biblical Poetry	
By KLAUS SEYBOLD †	582
1. The Legacy of the Eighteenth Century	585
2. Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette	587
3. Philology, History, Poetics and Linguistic-historical Commentaries	590

3.1. Hebrew Philology	591
3.2. History	591
3.3. Poetics	592
3.4. Historical-linguistic Commentaries on the Psalms until 1860	592
3.5. Job, Song of Songs, Lamentations	593
4. Conservatism: Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg and Franz Delitzsch	594
5. New Aspects in the last Decades of the Nineteenth Century	596
5.1. The Psalms	596
5.2. Job	597
5.3. Song of Songs	598
5.4. Lamentations	599
6. Bernhard Duhm's Commentaries of 1897 and 1899	599
7. Outlook into the Twentieth Century	602
22. Studies of the Didactical Books of the Hebrew Bible / Old Testament By KATHARINE J. DELL, Cambridge	603
1. Introduction	605
1.1. The Scholarly Climate in the Early Nineteenth Century	606
1.2. Scholarship in the Later Nineteenth Century	607
2. Proverbs	608
2.1. Dating and Authorship Issues	608
2.2. Dating and Literary Issues	609
2.3. The Character of Proverbial Wisdom and Use of Terminology	611
2.4. Cross Reference with the Wider Old Testament and the Development of Ideas	612
2.5. Late Dating Schemes at the End of the Century	614
3. Job	614
3.1. Did Job Live?	615
3.2. Date and Authorship	616
3.3. Stages of Literary Development	617
3.4. Theological Purpose and Position in Wider Development of Ideas	618
4. Ecclesiastes	619
4.1. Solomonic Authorship?	620
4.2. Links with the Greek World and Dating Issues	620
4.3. Redactions and Epilogue	621
4.4. Evaluations of the Message	622
5. Conclusion	624
23. The Question of a 'Biblical Theology' and the Growing Tension between 'Biblical Theology' and a 'History of the Religion of Israel': from Johann Philipp Gabler to Rudolf Smend, Sen. By JOACHIM SCHAPER, Aberdeen	625
1. Introduction	627
2. The 'Pre-history' of Biblical Theology	628

3. The Beginnings of Modern 'Biblical Theology': Gabler, his Immediate Predecessors and Contemporaries, and the Collision with Kant's Hermeneutics630
4. 'Biblical Theology' and the Impact of Hegel641
5. The Breakthrough of 'Historicism' Proper and its Consequences . .	.645
6. Epilogue650
24. Modernity's Canonical Crisis: Historiography and Theology in Collision By STEPHEN B. CHAPMAN, Durham, NC651
1. Modernity's Canonical Crisis656
2. J. G. Eichhorn: Canon as the Jerusalem Temple Archive659
3. Moses Stuart: Canon as the Scripture of Christ and the Apostles . .	.667
4. The Rise of the Three-Stage Theory673
4.1. H. Graetz: Canon as Three Assemblies676
4.2. H. E. Ryle: Canon as Three Canons681
Contributors691
Abbreviations696
Indexes (Names / Topics / References)705

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

'Higher Criticism': The Historical and Literary-critical Approach – with Special Reference to the Pentateuch

By THOMAS RÖMER, Paris/Lausanne

General bibliography: C. HOUTMAN, *Der Pentateuch. Die Geschichte seiner Erforschung nebst einer Auswertung* (CBET 9; Kampen 1994). – H.-J. KRAUS, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982). – A. DE PURY / T. RÖMER, "Le Pentateuque en question: position du problème et brève histoire de la recherche", in: *Le Pentateuque en question* (ed. A. de Pury / T. Römer; Le Monde de la Bible, 19; Geneva 1991), 9–80. – J. ROGERSON, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century. England and Germany* (London 1984). – H. GRAF REVENTLOW, *History of Biblical Interpretation, IV: From the Enlightenment to the Twentieth Century* (Resources for Biblical Studies, 63; Atlanta, GA 2010). – R. SMEND, *Deutsche Alttestamentler in drei Jahrhunderten* (Göttingen 1989).

1. W.M.L. de Wette

Works of de Wette: *Dissertatio, qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris opus esse monstratur* (1805), in: *Opuscula theologica* (Berlin 1830), 149–68, repr. and transl. into German in Mathys, *Dissertatio* (see below); *Auffoderung [sic!] zum Studium der Hebräischen Sprache und Litteratur: Zur Eröffnung seiner Vorlesungen* (Jena, Leipzig 1805); *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1–2 (Halle 1806–1807; repr. Darmstadt 1971); "Beytrag zur Charakteristik des Hebraismus", *Studien. Dritter Band* (ed. C. Daub / F. Creuzer; Heidelberg 1807), 241–312; *Lehrbuch der hebräisch-jüdischen Archäologie nebst einem Grundriss der hebräisch-jüdischen Geschichte* (Leipzig 1816; 1864); *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel Alten und Neuen Testaments, I. Die Einleitung in das Alte Testament enthaltend* (Berlin 1817; 1844); ET with additions by T. Parker: *Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament* (Boston 1843); *Die biblische Geschichte als Geschichte der Offenbarungen Gottes* (Berlin 1846).

Studies and bibliography: H.-P. MATHYS / K. SEYBOLD (eds.), *Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette: Ein Universaltheologe des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Studien zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Basel, NF 1; Basel 2001). – H.-P. MATHYS, "Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes *Dissertatio critico-exegetica* von 1805", *Biblische Theologie und historisches Denken. Wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studien. Aus Anlass der 50. Wiederkehr der Basler Promotion von Rudolf Smend* (ed. M. Kessler / M. Walraff; Studien zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Basel, NF 5; Basel 2008), 171–211. – J. ROGERSON, *W. M. L. de Wette, Founder of Modern Biblical Criticism. An Intellectual Biography* (JSOT.S 126; Sheffield 1992). – R. SMEND, "De Wette und das Verhältnis zwischen historischer Bibelkritik und philosophischem System im 19. Jahrhundert" (1958), *Epochen der Bibelkritik. Gesammelte Studien*, 3 (BEvTh 109; Munich 1991), 145–154. – E. STAEHELIN, *Dewettiana: Forschungen und Texte zu Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes Leben und Werk* (Studien zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Basel, 2; Basel 1956). – J.S. VATER, *Commentar über den Pentateuch. Mit Einleitungen zu den einzelnen Abschnitten der eingeschalteten Uebersetzung von Dr. Alexander Geddes's merkwürdigeren kritischen und exegetischen Anmerkungen, und einer Abhandlung über Moses und die Verfasser des Pentateuchs* (Halle 1802–1805).

Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette (1780–1849) is without doubt one of the most influential scholars of the Hebrew Bible of the nineteenth century. According to Rogerson, he could even be called the “founder of Modern Biblical Criticism”. He did, in fact, provide new insight into the understanding of the formation of the Hebrew Bible and especially the Pentateuch.

De Wette was born in Ulla, Saxony, on the 12th of January 1780. In the sixteenth century, his family had converted to Protestantism and moved from the Netherlands to Germany, in order to escape persecution. His father was a minister of the Lutheran church. In 1796, de Wette entered grammar school in Weimar, at a time when Goethe and Schiller were residents of the town. At grammar school, he met Herder, the Lutheran General Superintendent. Herder’s teaching and preaching fascinated de Wette, and this encounter motivated him to pursue his study of theology. In 1799, de Wette entered the University of Jena as a student of philosophy and theology. In philosophy, he attended lectures by Schelling, Hegel and the young scholar Fries. Later, Fries and de Wette became close friends, and the philosophical system of Fries, who was a follower of Kant, strongly influenced de Wette’s theological and exegetical work.¹ Fries, however, aimed to overcome the transcendental proofs by which Kant tried to demonstrate the existence of ideas. According to Fries, there is an anthropological necessity for the existence of the human intuitions of value, unity and harmony, even if the human understanding of the reality that lies behind these intuitions is limited. Nevertheless human beings are gifted with “*Abndung*”, premonitions of the ultimate realities.² Fries used the term “myth” to describe human attempts to express their intuitions of these ultimate realities.³ Similarly, de Wette would frequently use the term “myth” in order to characterize the narratives of the Penta- or Hexateuch. This may well betray the influence of Fries, but may also be inspired by the work of Christian Gottlob Heyne,⁴ the founder of the study of mythology.⁵ In 1805, de Wette presented his dissertation which we will take a closer look at below (see 1.1.). He was married in the same year, but his wife died shortly afterwards (in 1806). Several months later, Jena was plundered by French troops and de Wette lost all his possessions. After being appointed at the University of Heidelberg in 1807, he remarried in 1809 and was offered a professorship at the newly founded University of Berlin in 1810, where Schleiermacher was among his colleagues. After some initial rivalry,⁶ they

¹ There is some uncertainty how well de Wette knew Fries when he was a student in Jena. In his 1984 book, *OT Criticism*, Rogerson is very affirmative about a close relationship between the two while de Wette was still a student (pp. 36–40), yet in his book of 1992, on de Wette, he retracts this view (24–26) and concludes: “It can be said with confidence that there was no influence of Fries upon de Wette, and probably no friendship at that time” (26). Smend, *Deutsche Alttestamentler* (1989), 40, however, thinks that Fries began to influence de Wette while he was in Jena.

² J.F. FRIES, *Wissen, Glaube und Abndung* (1805) (Göttingen 1905; repr. and edited by L. Nelson), 171–327.

³ J.F. FRIES, *Sämtliche Schriften*, 6. *Neue oder anthropologische Kritik der Vernunft*, 3 (1831) (Aalen 1967).

⁴ Smend, *Deutsche Alttestamentler* (1989), 42.

⁵ On Heyne and the concept of myth see S. FORNARA, “Christian Gottlob Heyne dans l’histoire des études classiques”, *Revue Germanique Internationale* 14 (2011) 15–26.

⁶ In a letter to Schleiermacher, dated 24.7.1810 (edited in Stachelin, *Dewettiana*, 1956, 68), de

became close⁷ and strongly influenced each other. In 1819, and despite the opposition of Schleiermacher, de Wette was dismissed from his chair following a letter he wrote to the mother of Karl Ludwig Sand, the murderer of the reactionary poet August Kotzebue.⁸ After three years of exile spent in Weimar, de Wette was appointed at the Faculty of Theology at the University of Basel. After the death of his second wife he remarried again in 1833. He died in 1849, while serving as university principal for the fifth time.⁹

Initially attacked by Pietist groups because of his liberal teaching, de Wette turned more and more conservative towards the end of his life.¹⁰ De Wette's works that had a major influence on critical Hebrew Bible scholarship were not written in Basel, but in Jena and Berlin.

1.1. De Wette and Deuteronomy (1805)

In his short doctoral dissertation of 1805,¹¹ de Wette aimed to demonstrate the specific character of Deuteronomy with regard to the other books of the Pentateuch. He started by stating that it has become impossible to maintain the idea of Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, a statement that must have sounded somewhat optimistic at the time.¹² He was mainly interested in demonstrating that and in which respect the book of Deuteronomy is different from the books of Genesis to Numbers. Since Leviticus 26 constitutes a clear conclusion of the Mosaic Law and since Deuteronomy repeats this chapter in a different style, de Wette draws the conclusion that Deuteronomy stems from a different author.¹³ He also lists an important number of words and expressions that do not appear in the Tetrateuch.¹⁴ The fact that Deuteronomy also contains parallels to the laws and narratives of the preceding books shows that its author was familiar with those traditions and that his work must therefore date from a later period.¹⁵ De Wette further observes that the main focus of the Deuteronomical law lies on the

Wette assumes, however, that Schleiermacher was the initiator of his call to Berlin. Later he told Fries that Schleiermacher gave himself airs and that it was difficult to get close to him (Stahelin, *ibid.* 69). There was some competition between the two with regard to the number of students they would attract (letter to Fries of 31.12.1814; see Stahelin, *ibid.* 74).

⁷ Letter to Fries of 15.3.1817, see Stahelin, *ibid.* 78, and Schleiermacher's letter to de Wette, 5.4.1817, 78–80.

⁸ The letter is reprinted in Stahelin, *ibid.* 85–87.

⁹ For more details see Rogerson, W. M. L. de Wette (1992), 192–271.

¹⁰ See especially his book *Biblische Geschichte*, where he does not retract the critical investigation of the Bible, although he is in favour of a quite literalist approach when teaching the biblical story to the youth. The older de Wette's view of biblical history was influential for many conservative scholars who worked with the concept of a "history of salvation" (*Heilsgeschichte*).

¹¹ Reprinted 1830 in his *Opuscula*, now in Mathys, *Dissertatio* (2008), with a German translation. The work will be quoted after Mathys' edition. For a photo of this original publication's title, see Mathys, *ibid.* 183.

¹² Or is it polemical against scholars like Eichhorn, whom he tries to refute one year later in his *Beiträge*?

¹³ *Dissertatio* (ed. Mathys), 184–86.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 186–87.

¹⁵ *Libros illos novisse et ante oculos habuisse auctorem nostrum insitias ire non possumus*, *ibid.* 191–192.

authority of the Jerusalemite Temple and the idea of a centralization of the cult. This idea is a novelty; the books of Samuel and Kings containing narratives like 1 Kings 3, where Salomon offers sacrifices at Gibeon, without any negative comment. The law of Deuteronomy 12 clearly contradicts Exod 20:21–22. It comes close to Leviticus 17, which states that all sacrifices must be offered at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting, but the laws in Leviticus never refer to this concept, contrary to Deuteronomy 14–17. The passages in Leviticus must therefore predate Deuteronomy.¹⁶ The historical context of the attempt to make the Temple of Jerusalem the only legitimate sanctuary was the time of Josiah. In a lengthy footnote, de Wette states that *illum enim codicem legum ab Hilikia sacerdote inventum* (2 Reg. 22.) *Deuteronomium nostrum fuisse haud improbabili conjectura judicare potest.*¹⁷ The identification of the book discovered in 2 Kings 22 with the book of Deuteronomy was not new; it is attested in Jerome and in Chrysostom.¹⁸ While the identification of Deuteronomy with Josiah's law book was nothing new, the possibility that Deuteronomy could stem from the time of Josiah was, and it would allow a precise date for the book of Deuteronomy. Although de Wette, who was cautious, did not explicitly state this in his dissertation, he provided, as O. Eissfeldt put it, "Pentateuchal criticism with a 'point of Archimedes' to which it could attach itself in order to deliver it from the bonds of church and synagogue tradition, and put in its place an alternative dating of the Pentateuch".¹⁹ In his *Beiträge* (the first volume of which appeared only one year later), de Wette was more precise. On pages 168–79, he tries to refute Eichhorn's view that the discovered law book was old and well known.²⁰ In a careful analysis of 2 Kings 22, de Wette demonstrates that the narrative itself proves that the book was formerly unknown and probably hidden in the Temple by the priest Hilkiyah,²¹ thus supporting the idea of a seventh-century BC origin of Deuteronomy. De Wette also argued, referring to Vater, that the book which triggered the Josianic Reform "was not our Deuteronomy in its present form and extent since, as Vater has shown, it has been put together from a number of pieces".²²

¹⁶ De Wette never accepted the idea held by Graf and others that the "priestly" texts in Leviticus and elsewhere were later than the book of Deuteronomy.

¹⁷ *Dissertatio* (ed. Mathys), 190.

¹⁸ For details see Mathys, *Dissertatio* (2008), 174–81.

¹⁹ O. EISSFELDT, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (New York 1965), 171.

²⁰ Since quoting rules were at that time liberal, de Wette never quotes the pages precisely. He seems to refer to J. G. EICHHORN, *Einleitung ins Alte Testament*, 1–3 (Reutlingen 1790), vol. 2, 257–260 (§ 411).

²¹ *Beiträge*, I, 170. But here, also he remains cautious: *Doch bin ich weit davon entfernt, diese Vermuthung zur Gewisheit erheben zu wollen ... Woher das Buch gekommen sey, darüber zieht die Geschichte ihren Vorhang und es würde vermessen seyn, ihn wegziehen zu wollen.*

²² *Beiträge*, I, 177 (transl. from Rogerson, W. M. L. de Wette, 1992, 58).

1.2. *de Wette and Vater*

At the end of his dissertation, de Wette refers to Johan Severin Vater's third volume on the Pentateuch,²³ describing him as a "*socius*" with regard to his ideas about the formation of the Pentateuch. While de Wette only mentions that he found this work delightful, Griesbach, de Wette's teacher in Jena, tells us that de Wette was half delighted, half shocked.²⁴ Therefore, he probably shortened and hastened the publication of his "Contributions" of 1806–1807, in which he outlines his ideas about the formation of the Pentateuch and the historical books. As far as the Pentateuch is concerned, these ideas are quite similar to those expressed by Vater. Johan Severin Vater (1771–1826)²⁵ was above all a linguist (a specialist in Slavonic and indigenous American languages) and also a biblical scholar. In 1798, he was appointed professor in Jena, yet he moved to Halle in 1799, which is why it is uncertain whether de Wette knew him at that time. After the French had closed the University of Halle, Vater went to Königsberg, where he taught theology, and came back to Halle in 1820. In the title of his three-volume commentary on the Pentateuch, Vater explicitly refers to the Scottish biblical scholar A. Geddes,²⁶ who had characterized the Pentateuch as a combination of different and originally unrelated fragments. In his commentary, Vater provides a German translation of Geddes' *Critical Remarks* (he was a linguist!) and offers his own view on the formation of the Pentateuch, which he perceives to be the result of a compilation of hundreds of fragments. Vater criticized the documentary hypothesis held by Astruc, Eichhorn and Ilgen, by showing that it is impossible to reconstruct two separate coherent documents, one that uses "elohim" and one that uses "Jehova",²⁷ and by pointing out that in books like Kings or Chronicles, both names can be used by the same author. Vater also acknowledged the specific character of Genesis and Deuteronomy in comparison to Exodus-Numbers.²⁸ Genesis and Numbers are the most fragmentary books, but even Deuteronomy is the result of the combination of about twenty fragments: Deut 28 could represent an original conclusion which was complemented by various fragments in several stages. While Geddes had been quite optimistic about the fact that Moses could have written an important number of the fragments of the Pentateuch himself, and while he argued that the most plausible time of its compilation was the time of Solomon, Vater showed himself very sceptical about the existence of fragments of Mosaic origin, although he did not completely reject the possibility. He thought, however, that the first law collection was formed in early monarchic

²³ Vater, *Commentar* (1802/05).

²⁴ Griesbach in his *Vorrede* to de Wette's *Beiträge: halb erfreut, und halb erschrocken* (v). According to Griesbach, and after consultation with Vater, de Wette published his *Beiträge* very quickly, in order not to be suspected of having only copied from Vater (see vi–vii).

²⁵ E. KUHN, "Vater, Johann Severin", *ADB* 39 (1895), 503–508; <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118767372.html?anchor=adb> (30.5.2012).

²⁶ On Geddes see *HBOT* II (2008), 964–970 (W. McKane)

²⁷ *Commentar*, 3, 696–728.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 514: *Die Genesis könnte als etwas für sich Bestehendes schon vorhanden gewesen seyn ... Auch Deuteronomium könnte seinem größten Theile nach schon ohne Rücksicht auf die vorhergehenden Bücher zu einem Ganzen vereinigt worden seyn.*

times and considered that the Pentateuch came into existence towards the end of the monarchy and received its definitive form in exilic times.²⁹

De Wette held a similar view in his *Beiträge*, considering the Pentateuch to be the result of the bringing together of formerly independent fragments. He argued, however, that the well-organized arrangement of the fragments necessitated the existence of a basic framework into which the different fragments were incorporated. This framework, which de Wette thought could roughly be reconstructed up to the Sinai revelation in the book of Exodus (Gen 1:1–2:4; 5; 6:9–22; 7:11–24; 8:1–5, 13–19; 9:1–7; 11:10–32*; 17; 23; 35:9–15; Exod 1–2*; 11–12*; 13*; 19:7–19; 20),³⁰ coincided largely with Eichhorn's "Elohim document". This epic of the Israelite monarchy was written in monarchic times and later complemented by the fragments, which were combined in the books of Leviticus and Numbers. Leviticus was the work of later priests who added their ritual laws; the compilers of the book of Numbers imitated fragments of Exodus displaying a mixture of ceremonial laws and mythological accounts typical of a later composition.³¹ The book of Deuteronomy, finally, was something totally different, providing a reinterpretation of materials contained in the books of Exodus and Numbers.³² In the theocratic epic, later texts that imitated older ones were also incorporated as, for instance, the account of God's covenant with Abraham, which reinterprets Genesis 17.³³

Following the advice of his teacher Griesbach, de Wette's first volume focuses on the historical books of the Hebrew Bible, especially Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, which was meant to distinguish his work from that of Vater. In this volume, de Wette declares that anyone interested in the history of ancient Israel must pay attention to the evolution of the Israelite religion. This interest in the evolution of religious concepts, which betrays the influence of Schelling and Fries,³⁴ foreshadows the theories of Wellhausen and others. In order to reconstruct ancient Israelite history, de Wette states that Samuel-Kings and Chronicles offer two contradictory accounts. De Wette denied the historical credibility of the Chronicles which he dated around 330 BCE. The books of Samuel and Kings, edited around 550 BCE, were deemed more reliable by him. The author of Chronicles used Samuel-Kings as a source and reworked the accounts according to his own theological viewpoints.³⁵ De Wette's demonstration is so convin-

²⁹ Ibid. 673–681.

³⁰ *Beiträge*, II, 29.

³¹ Ibid. 279.

³² Ibid. 385 ff.

³³ Here again de Wette appears as a forerunner of contemporary Pentateuchal scholarship. After the identification of the "Elohim document" with the Priestly document (see below), Genesis 15 was mostly held to be older than Genesis 17. Only recently has it been recognized that this view is problematic and that Genesis 15 is probably later than the priestly account of Genesis 17; see among others T. RÖMER, "Gen 15 und Gen 17. Beobachtungen und Anfragen zu einem Dogma der 'neueren' und 'neuesten' Pentateuchkritik", *DBAT* 26 (1990) 32–47; J. C. GERTZ, "Abraham, Mose und der Exodus. Beobachtungen zur Redaktionsgeschichte von Genesis 15", *Abschied vom Jahwisten. Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J. C. Gertz / K. Schmid / M. Witte; BZAW 315; Berlin / New York 2002), 63–81; K. SCHMID, *Genesis and the Moses Story. Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible* (Siphut 3; Winona Lake, IN 2010).

³⁴ Smend, *Deutsche Alttestamentler* (1989), 40 and 47.

³⁵ *Beiträge*, I, 5–136.

cing that most scholars accept his theory until today, although sometimes modified.³⁶

De Wette was also a forerunner of "Deuteronomistic studies". In the first volume of his *Beiträge*, he describes Joshua as a late book that depends on Deuteronomy and can be characterized as "deuteronomistic" in style and theology.³⁷ De Wette's arguments concerning the centralization of the cult and the existence of a law book make the period of Josiah a crucial time for the history of Israelite religion. By entrenching the birth of Deuteronomistic theology in the time of Josiah, de Wette profoundly marked subsequent research.³⁸

1.3. *The Pentateuch as a Mythical Story of Origins*

As noted above, de Wette's interest in his *Beiträge* was to reconstruct the evolution of the religion of ancient Israel. He reckoned that at the beginning, there was no need for sanctuaries and priests, but a total freedom of cultic concerns: *Wie bey den Patriarchen und homerischen Griechen, war Gottes freier Himmel sein Tempel, jede Mahlzeit ein Opfer ... und jeder Prophet, König und Hausvater ohne weitere Umstände Priester.*³⁹ After the erection of the Jerusalem Temple, open sanctuaries and cultic freedom remained in existence. It was under Josiah that this freedom came to an end.⁴⁰ De Wette was not particularly interested in what came after the Exile. In his *Biblische Dogmatik*, however, he characterizes Judaism as a *verunglückte Wiederherstellung des Hebraismus*.⁴¹ In 1807, he published another "Contribution" devoted to the character of "Hebraism", the Israelite religion before Judaism.⁴² In this study he mainly analyzes the books of Psalms, Job and Qoheleth, claiming that the Hebrew Bible witnesses a religion of misfortune (to which Christianity offers consolation). According to de Wette, the Hebrew religion displays the ethical idea of one God as a holy will. However, this idea occurs in mythical form in the narratives of the Old Testament.⁴³ De Wette's emphasis on myths can be explained when bearing in mind the intellectual context of his time. Rogerson rightly states: "mythology was one of the

³⁶ Most scholars still accept the view that the Chronicler drew from Samuel-Kings, although from a different textual form than the one conserved in the MT. The older view that Samuel-Kings and Chronicler drew from a common source, which according to Rogerson, *OT Criticism* (1984), 22, was the view of Eichhorn, has recently been defended by A. G. AULD, *Kings Without Privilege. David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings* (Edinburgh 1994), and R. F. PERSON JR., *The Deuteronomistic History and the Books of Chronicles. Scribal Works in an Oral World* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature, 6; Atlanta, GA, 2010).

³⁷ *Beiträge*, I, 137. In the second note of this page, de Wette even envisages the same author for Deuteronomy and Joshua and qualifies passages as Josh 1:2–9 and 23:3–16 as *ganz deuteronomisch*.

³⁸ T. RÖMER / A. DE PURY, "Deuteronomistic Historiography (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues", *Israel Constructs Its History. Deuteronomistic History in Recent Research* (ed. A. de Pury / T. Römer / J.-D. Macchi; JSOT.S 306; Sheffield 2000), 24–141; for de Wette see 32–35.

³⁹ *Beiträge*, I, 255.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 258.

⁴¹ W. ZIMMERLI, "Biblische Theologie, I", *TRE* 6 (1980), 426–55, 430.

⁴² *Beytrag* (1807).

⁴³ *Ibid.* 304: the story of Genesis 2–3 is a myth for the passage from a stage of innocence to a stage of knowledge and contradictions.

major preoccupations of the literary world in Germany from the last third of the eighteenth century".⁴⁴ The perception of the Pentateuch as a mythical text is a central idea in de Wette's works on the Hebrew Bible,⁴⁵ from his inaugural lecture through to his last work on the Old Testament.⁴⁶ De Wette did not deny that figures like Abraham or Moses were historical,⁴⁷ yet he argued that nothing historical could be known about them. Most of the Pentateuchal narratives are mythical since they do not correspond with the laws of nature and contradict general experience (e.g. the appearance of angels, the parting of the sea, the crossing of the sea of more than 600.000 Israelite men with their families in one night).⁴⁸

Criticizing scholars like Eichhorn, de Wette emphasized the fact that the Pentateuch and the whole Bible should not be used as sources for the reconstruction of secular history. Biblical narratives are made up of myths and traditions. Therefore, we do not dispose of historical witnesses, with the exception of some prophets, but even those do not provide the historian with much material.⁴⁹ Even if this statement is somewhat contradictory to his treatment of the books of Samuel and Kings, de Wette initiates a new phase of Biblical research with regard to the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets; and a great number of his insights and theories were later taken up by Wellhausen and others. So he is himself a "symbol" for a new paradigm in Biblical Studies.

2. The Emergence of Theories about the Formation of the Pentateuch

2.1. *Moses and the Pentateuch*

Bibliography: F. BLEEK, "Einige aphoristische Beiträge zu den Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch", *Biblich-exegetisches Repertorium*, I (ed. E. F. K. Rosenmüller / G. H. Rosenmüller; Leipzig 1822), 1-79. – A. CLARKE, *The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, the text carefully printed from the most correct copies of the present authorized translation, including the marginal readings and parallel texts: with a commentary and critical notes designed as a help to a better understanding of the sacred writings* (Nashville 1977; repr. from the 6th edition 1851 [first edition 1825]). – S. DAVIDSON, *The Text of the Old Testament Considered; with a Treatise on Sacred Interpretation; and a brief Introduction to the Old Testament Books and the Apocrypha* (London 1856); *An Introduction to the Old Testament Critical, Historical, and Theological: Containing a Discussion of the Most Important Questions* (Edinburgh 1862). – F. DELITZSCH / C. F. KEIL (eds.), *Biblischer Commentar über das Alte Testament*, 1-17 (Leipzig 1861-1875); ET: *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament* (Edinburgh 1864-1892; new rev. edition: Peabody, MA 1996). – J. G. EICHHORN, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, I-III ([1780-1783] 4th edition Göttingen 1823/1844). – F. H. W. GESENIUS, *Geschichte der heb-*

⁴⁴ Rogerson, W. M. L. de Wette (1992), 48; see also idem, *Myth in Old Testament Interpretation* (BZAW 134; Berlin / New York 1974).

⁴⁵ Aufforderung (1805).

⁴⁶ Lehrbuch (1816), "de Wette's last work on the Old Testament", so Rogerson, W. M. L. de Wette (1992), 135.

⁴⁷ In Beiträge, II (1807), 274, de Wette argues that Moses did indeed promulgate the primitive form of the Decalogue.

⁴⁸ Ibid. 173.

⁴⁹ Aufforderung (1805), 28.

räischen Sprache und Schrift: eine philologisch-historische Einleitung in Sprachlehren und Wörterbücher der hebräischen Sprache (Leipzig 1815; repr. Hildesheim 1973). – R. H. COHEN, *Reclaiming the Hebrew Bible: German-Jewish Reception of Biblical Criticism* (Studia Judaica, 56; Berlin 2010). – A. T. HARTMANN, *Historisch-kritische Forschungen über Bildung, Zeitalter und Plan der 5 Bücher Moses* (Rostock 1831). – E. W. HENGSTENBERG, *Die Authentie des Pentateuches*, 1–2 (Beiträge zur Einleitung ins Alte Testament, 2–3; Berlin 1836–1839); ET: *Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, 1–2 (Edinburgh 1858–1868; repr. Grands Rapids 1970); *Die Bücher Mose's und Aegypten; nebst einer Beilage: Manetho und die Hyksos* (Berlin 1841). – H. D. M. SPENCE-JONES / J. S. EXELL (eds.), *The Pulpit Commentary*, 1–36 (London 1882–1892). – T. SÖRENSEN, *Historisch-kritischer Kommentar zur Genesis* (Kiel 1851). – M. VERNES, *Les résultats de l'exégèse biblique: l'histoire, la religion, la littérature* (Paris 1890). – L. ZUNZ, *Kleine gesammelte Schriften*, 1 (Berlin 1875).

When Astruc wrote his *Conjectures*, in which he outlined the Documentary Hypothesis combined with a Fragment Hypothesis, he did this in an apologetic perspective, aiming to defend the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He claimed that Moses had at his disposal documents which he used and which latter redactors misused.⁵⁰ Even if Mosaic authorship had been rejected on several occasions in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (by Spinoza and others), it was still defended in the first half of the nineteenth. Eichhorn in his influential *Introduction* of 1780–1783 (the fourth edition published in 1823/24) argued that the book of Genesis was almost completed at the time of Moses who had used ancient sources.⁵¹ The same applies to the books of Exodus–Deuteronomy that were all composed by Moses or men that were close to him. The final shape of the Pentateuch was achieved in the time between Joshua and Samuel.⁵²

In England, Adam Clarke defended Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in a commentary on the Old Testament published in 1825.⁵³ Yet he felt free to emend the text and allowed for the possibility that the Pentateuch contained interpolations most probably made by Ezra in Persian times – but since Ezra was also inspired, his additions were of the same authority as the documents compiled and written by Moses.⁵⁴ A quite similar view was still held in 1881 by Thomas Whitelaw, who also conceded revisions by Ezra and rejected the objections against Mosaic authorship made by de Wette, Ewald, Kuenen, Wellhausen and others as “simply incredible”.⁵⁵

In Germany, there was also much resistance against a rationalist approach to the Bible. The major figure was Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg (1802–1869),⁵⁶ trained in theology and Oriental languages and strongly influenced by the awa-

⁵⁰ J. ASTRUC, *Conjectures sur la Genèse. Introduction et notes de Pierre Gibert* (Paris 1999); on Astruc see HBOT II (2008), 846–47.

⁵¹ Einleitung, III (1783), 93. In the fourth edition (1844), Eichhorn has become more cautious in regard to the final composer of Genesis: his name does not really matter. See also A. WESTPHAL, *Les sources du Pentateuque. Étude de critique et d'histoire*, I–II (Paris 1888), I, 122.

⁵² Einleitung, III (1783), 177–362.

⁵³ The commentary of Genesis is from 1810; for details on Clarke see Rogerson, OT Criticism (1984), 180–82.

⁵⁴ Preface to the commentary of Genesis (unnumbered page).

⁵⁵ “The Authorship of the Pentateuch”, published in the series “The Pulpit Commentary”, quoted according to Rogerson, OT Criticism (1984), 287.

⁵⁶ J. BACHMANN, *Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg: Sein Leben und Wirken*, 1–3 (Gütersloh 1876–1892); Reventlow, Interpretation, IV (2010), 286–298.

kening movement, which had greatly expanded in the 1820s, especially in Berlin (where Hengstenberg taught as the successor of de Wette from 1826 until his death) and Pomerania (Pommern). Against de Wette and the “rationalists”, Hengstenberg defended the authenticity of all prophetic books of the Bible as well as of the Pentateuch. In 1836 and 1839, he published a two-volume work, *The Authenticity of the Pentateuch* (*Die Authentie des Pentateuches*). In this book (which displays a somewhat confusing disposition), Hengstenberg tries to show that the Pentateuch existed a long time before Ezra. He starts by claiming that prophets like Amos and Hosea knew the Pentateuch (cf. Hosea 12 and Am 2:7) as did the authors of Kings (1 Kings 18 presupposes Lev 1:6–8; 1 Kgs 21:13 knows of Lev 25:33)⁵⁷. Contrary to other conservative critics, Hengstenberg did not accept the idea that the Pentateuch was composed by combining two or more sources. Hengstenberg attacked Astruc’s main argument by claiming (rightly)⁵⁸ that the use of *Yhwh* and *Elohim* respectively does not point to different sources. Both names have different meanings, and thus one author might use them both.⁵⁹ In his second volume, Hengstenberg deals with the anachronisms in the Pentateuch. Contrary to scholars like Clarke, who allowed for later interpolations, Hengstenberg thought that such a position would speak against the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch. He therefore tries to demonstrate that there are, in fact, no real anachronisms.⁶⁰ The same applies to contradictions and doublets, the existence of which Hengstenberg tries to deny by symbolic interpretations or by claiming that parallel passages refer to different events.⁶¹ Most of his arguments are, as Reventlow put it, “spurious” and “occasioned by his fundamentalist guidelines”.⁶² Finally, Hengstenberg was one of only few biblical scholars who immediately tried to take into account the discoveries of the new field of Egyptology into their scholarship – although he was, once again, guided by his apologetic position. In his 1841 work *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, published less than twenty years after the decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphs by Champollion (1821), Hengstenberg tried to prove the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch by claiming that the image of Egypt, as it is depicted in the Joseph and Exodus narratives, corresponds exactly to Egyptian sources of the time of Moses – an erroneous affirmation.⁶³ Hengstenberg was very influential in Prussian university politics and prompted the appointment of several conservative professors of theology.

One of Hengstenberg’s influential students was C. F. Keil (1807–1888)⁶⁴, professor of Bible and oriental studies at Dorpat (Tartu). After his retirement in

⁵⁷ *Authentic*, I (1836), 48–180.

⁵⁸ In recent scholarship, scholars with different backgrounds have shown that the alternation of *Yhwh* and *Elohim* should not be used as a main criterion for source criticism; see, for instance, E. BLUM, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984), 471–75.

⁵⁹ *Authentic*, I, 306–414.

⁶⁰ *Authentic*, II (1839), 179–338.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 346–399.

⁶² Reventlow, *Interpretation IV* (2010), 296.

⁶³ See on this D. B. REDFORD, *A Study of the Biblical Story of Joseph* (*Genesis 37–50*) (VT.S 20; Leiden 1970); M. GÖRG, *Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Alten Israel und Ägypten: von den Anfängen bis zum Exil* (EdF 290; Darmstadt 1997).

⁶⁴ P. SIEMENS, *Carl Friedrich Keil (1807–1888). Leben und Werk* (Gießen 1994).

1859, Keil moved to Leipzig, where he completed his main scholarly work, the *Biblicher Commentar über das Alte Testament*, a series he co-edited with Franz Delitzsch, to which he contributed the commentaries on the five books of the Pentateuch, the Former and Latter Prophets, as well as Ruth, Lamentations, Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles (first edition 1861–1875). This collection, which was also translated into English, proved very influential in German and English conservative scholarship and has remained, until today, a standard work for conservative and fundamentalist Christian colleges. Like Hengstenberg, Keil's aim was to demonstrate the unity and coherence of the Pentateuch by showing that it does not contain real contradictions or other particularities that would necessitate the assumption that different documents were used in its composition. Some of his observations are indeed quite astute; they show that some so-called "contradictions" in the Pentateuch do not have to be regarded as such and do not speak in favour of a radical Documentary or Fragment Hypothesis.

Friedrich Bleek (1793–1859),⁶⁵ who advocated the idea of Mosaic origins of the Pentateuch,⁶⁶ also held a rather conservative view although he admitted that the Pentateuch as a whole originated in the time of the monarchy. The Penta- or rather Hexateuch was the result of the combination of an older account contained in the books of Genesis–Numbers and Joshua. This account was the work of an author using Mosaic and other documents and writing between the reigns of Saul and Solomon. The account was supplemented by the author of Deuteronomy, who also added passages in the books of Genesis–Numbers. This Pentateuch was then discovered in the temple at the time of Josiah. Contemporaneously, the book of Joshua was separated from the Law of Moses.⁶⁷

The rejection of Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch was a challenge for Jewish intellectuals and biblical scholars, too. As HaCohen rightly points out, there was a desire in Reform Judaism, represented by scholars like Levi Herzfeld, Julius Popper and Abraham Geiger, to take up biblical criticism, yet this was prevented by pressures internal and external to the Jewish community, and the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* never really engaged in a critical investigation of the Bible,⁶⁸ although there were exceptions like Zunz – as will be shown below.

Even if the conservative positions of Hengstenberg and others remained popular throughout the nineteenth century, they could not prevent the emergence of a new view of the formation of the Pentateuch and the Bible, which turned out to be a rather late and complex document. The change toward a more rationalist view, which had already taken shape in the early nineteenth century (de Wette, Vater), is represented by Samuel Davidson (1807–1898)⁶⁹ who was appointed professor of Biblical Criticism at the Lancashire Independent College in Manchester in 1842. After being appointed, he wrote an introduction to the Old Tes-

⁶⁵ Smend, *Alttestamentler* (1989), 71–84.

⁶⁶ In *Beiträge* (1822), 11, he sees the *höchste Wahrscheinlichkeit [...] daß die schriftliche Aufzeichnung dieser Gesetze schon dem Mose oder dessen Zeitalter angehöre*.

⁶⁷ *Beiträge* (1822), 44–62.

⁶⁸ HaCohen, *Reclaiming* (2010), 78–85.

⁶⁹ Rogerson, *OT Criticism* (1984), 197–208.

tament⁷⁰ in which he adopted a rather conservative position, considering, for instance, the Eden Narrative in Gen 2–3 to be a literal account.⁷¹ He defended the thesis that Moses wrote the book of Deuteronomy as well as the Sinai legislation and the wilderness itineraries.⁷² For the rest of the books of Genesis to Numbers, Davidson adopted, against Hengstenberg and Keil, a documentary theory, postulating an *Elohim document* from the time of Joshua and a *Jehovah document* from the time of the Judges; both documents were combined in the early monarchy.⁷³ Davidson pointed out that the Bible did not state explicitly that Moses wrote the entire Pentateuch. He also insisted on the fact that inspiration did not cease with Moses.⁷⁴ Yet this rather conservative position provoked letters of protest which led to Davidson's resignation from his position.⁷⁵ Following his dismissal, he worked as a private tutor and published a three-volume *Introduction to the Old Testament* in 1862, in which he moved towards a much more critical position. He agreed with Hupfeld, whom he knew personally, on the theory of three documents (see below), which he dated between the time of Saul (the elder Elohist) and Uzziah (the Jehovist).⁷⁶ Those sources continued in the book of Joshua, which Davidson considered to be older than the book of Deuteronomy⁷⁷ that was not Mosaic any more. Davidson dated it to the seventh century BCE,⁷⁸ thus adopting de Wette's position, for whom "he felt particular sympathy . . ., perhaps because both he and de Wette had suffered dismissal".⁷⁹

Davidson's biography is representative of the shift of nineteenth-century Old Testament scholarship. Although the documentary hypothesis emerged in an apologetic perspective (Astruc, Witter), the application of a literary model of the Pentateuch rendered the idea of its Mosaic authorship impossible on a scientific level.

An increasing number of scholars came to the conclusion that the beginning of the Pentateuch had to be located in the monarchic period. The grammarian Wilhelm Gesenius (1786–1842)⁸⁰ defended on philological grounds the lateness of Chronicles compared to Samuel–Kings. In his history of the Hebrew Language (*Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache*), he introduced the distinction of pre-exilic and post-exilic Hebrew, still used today, and demonstrated that Chronicles clearly displays a late form of the Hebrew language, contrary to Kings. Gesenius insisted on the stylistic and philological similarities between Deuteronomy and

⁷⁰ He was asked to revise Horne's introduction, but finally decided to rewrite a new introduction to the OT.

⁷¹ Text (1856), 576.

⁷² Ibid. 616.

⁷³ Ibid. 631.

⁷⁴ Ibid. 632–33.

⁷⁵ For more details see Rogerson, *OT Criticism* (1984), 201–206. On the one hand Davidson was accused of doubting the plenary inspiration of the Bible. On the other hand he was (anonymously) accused of the plagiarism of German scholars, especially Keil. As Rogerson shows, there are indeed very strong parallels between Keil and Davidson, but Davidson very often does not agree with Keil's conclusions.

⁷⁶ Introduction I (1862), 50–51.

⁷⁷ Ibid. 424.

⁷⁸ Ibid. 383.

⁷⁹ Rogerson, *OT Criticism* (1984), 208.

⁸⁰ Smend, *Alttestamentler* (1989), 53–70.

the book of Jeremiah that confirmed a late seventh-century dating for Deuteronomy, the latest book of the Pentateuch. Since the other books of the Pentateuch are very close to other narrative books from the monarchic period, it appears that the Pentateuch was written during that time. Anton Theodor Hartmann (1774–1838) took a similar position. He doubted that Moses was able to write and argued that the language of the Pentateuch parallels writings from the time between Hezekiah and the Babylonian exile.⁸¹ A student of Gesenius, Wilhelm Vatke, to whom we will return later, denied any historical value of the book of Genesis⁸² and argued that the laws of the Pentateuch revealed the unhistorical character of the Mosaic state.⁸³ The historical Moses was probably a prophet, but he did not write the Pentateuch.

In the course of the second half of the nineteenth century, the claim of Mosaic authenticity was given up by most, and the formation of the Pentateuch was dated between the time of the early monarchy and the Babylonian exile. Some scholars, however, dated the Pentateuch much later, as, for instance, Leopold Zunz (1794–1886),⁸⁴ who claimed that Leviticus was younger than Deuteronomy and Ezekiel and was written in the Second Temple period.⁸⁵ Specific evidence of the existence of a Pentateuch does not exist before the fourth century BCE.⁸⁶ T. Sørensen situated the formation of the Pentateuch in the context of 125 BCE, when John Hyrcanus ordered his publication for the synagogical cult.⁸⁷ The Pentateuch may incorporate some older sources, but sometimes what sounds archaic dovetails better with the Hellenistic period. This is the case, for instance, with the law of circumcision in Genesis 17 the historical context of which seems to be the time following Antiochus IV.⁸⁸ In France, M. Vernes⁸⁹ dated the oldest documents of the Hexateuch around 400 BCE (he dated Deuteronomy around 250) and its completion around 200 BCE.⁹⁰ In fact, most nineteenth-century scholars postulated the existence of a Hexateuch, prior to the truncated Pentateuch.

⁸¹ *Forschungen* (1831), 643–676.

⁸² *Theologie* (1835), 184.

⁸³ *Ibid.* 205.

⁸⁴ *Schriften* (1875). The first part of the article "*Bibelkritisches*" (217–70) had been published 1873 in *ZDMG* 27 (669–89). On Zunz, see N. N. GLATZER (ed.), *Leopold Zunz, Jude, Deutscher, Europäer; ein jüdisches Gelehrtenchicksal des 19. Jahrhunderts in Briefen an Freunde* (Tübingen 1964); HaCohen, *Reclaiming*, 195–97.

⁸⁵ *Schriften* (1875), 237.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 242.

⁸⁷ *Genesis* (1851), 24.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 146.

⁸⁹ For Vernes see P. CABANEL, "Un fils prodigue du protestantisme: Maurice Vernes (1845–1923) et l'histoire des religions", *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 149 (2003) 481–510.

⁹⁰ *Résultats* (1890), 181–204.

2.2. Hexateuch instead of Pentateuch

Bibliography: H. EWALD, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, 1–6 (Göttingen 1843–1859); ET: *History of Israel* (London 1867–1886); “Review of J.J. Stähelin, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Genesis* (1830)”, *ThStKr* (1831) 596–606. – A. GEDDES, *The Holy Bible, Or The Books Accounted Sacred By Jews And Christians; Otherwise Called The Books of the Old and New Covenants* (London 1792). – G.F. OEHLER, *Theologie des Alten Testaments. Erster Band: Einleitung und Mosaismus* (Tübingen 1873).

According to Houtman, the term “Hexateuch” appeared in biblical scholarship in the nineteenth century⁹¹ – in fact already at the end of the eighteenth century – but it is difficult to know who invented it. Later, similar terms were coined, for example “Heptateuch” (Genesis–Judges), “Octateuch” (Genesis–Samuel) and “Enneateuch” (Genesis–Kings). The idea of a Hexateuch⁹² probably emerged on the basis of two observations. First, the narrative coherence of the books of Genesis to Joshua seems greater than that of Genesis to Deuteronomy. The patriarchal narratives emphasize the promise of the land and this promise reaches its fulfilment only in the book of Joshua. The end of Deuteronomy clearly indicates a continuation as its last chapters (Deuteronomy 31 and 34) insist on the installation of Joshua as Moses’ successor who is in charge of accomplishing the conquest of the land. Also, the final discourse of Joshua, after the conquest and the distribution of the land, clearly concludes the narrative from the time of the Patriarchs to the entry into the land (Joshua 24). Second, there are stylistic links between the book of Joshua and the preceding books, especially Deuteronomy. In 1792, the first part of Alexander Geddes’ translation and introduction to the Bible contained the books of Genesis to Joshua. Geddes argued that the book of Joshua belonged to the Pentateuch since it stemmed from the same author and presented a necessary appendix to the rest of the narrative.⁹³ In a review of Stähelin’s book on Genesis (1831) and differently from his earlier position,⁹⁴ Ewald postulated an Elohistic document as the origin of the Pentateuch which contained a narrative starting with the creation of the world and ending with the conquest of Canaan, a Hexateuch of a sort. In his later *History of Israel*, however, Ewald postulated the existence of a “Great Book of Origins” that comprised the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua. This book resulted from the combination of numerous ancient fragments reworked and augmented by several “narrators”.⁹⁵ The original “story of origins” from creation to the conquest of the land did not comprise the book of Deuteronomy, which emerged during the reign of Manasseh. The Deuteronomistic character of many passages in Joshua could be explained by the reworking of the Joshua narrative by the author of

⁹¹ Houtman, *Pentateuch* (1994), 3.

⁹² The idea is, of course, much older than the use of the term in the academic discussion. See, for instance, the so-called “old English Hexateuch”, the translation of the books of Genesis to Joshua into Old English in the tenth or eleventh century.

⁹³ Bible (1792), xviii–xix.

⁹⁴ In his first book on the composition of the Genesis, Ewald had postulated one author for the whole book of the Genesis: H. EWALD, *Die Komposition der Genesis kritisch untersucht* (Braunschweig 1823).

⁹⁵ *Geschichte*, I (1843), 73–164; ET: 73–164.

Deuteronomy. The combination between Deuteronomy and the narrative in Genesis – Numbers and Joshua occurred between the seventh century and the fall of Jerusalem.

The idea of a Hexateuch is adopted by most theories about the formation of the first books of the Bible. Particularly in different variations of the documentary hypothesis, the book of Joshua is seen as the end of several of the documents combined in the Pentateuch. Even if the term "Pentateuch" is used, scholars adopt the idea that Joshua belonged to the first part of the Hebrew Bible. An example among many others can be found in Oehler's *Theology of the Old Testament*, where the Pentateuch (!) comprises four periods: the origins, the time after the Flood, the Patriarchs, and the time of Moses and Joshua.⁹⁶ The book of Joshua must be analyzed together with the Pentateuch, *weil das Buch in seinem ganzen schriftstellerischen Charakter wie seinen biblisch-theologischen Grundideen nach wesentlich mit dem Pentateuch zusammenhängt*.⁹⁷ The idea of a Hexateuch remained prevalent until the middle of the twentieth century⁹⁸ when Martin Noth's theory of a Deuteronomistic History (1943)⁹⁹ created, in fact, a Tetratauch (Genesis–Numbers) instead of a Hexateuch, because Deuteronomy and Joshua were now regarded as the introduction to a Deuteronomistic history. At the end of the twentieth century, when Noth's theory came under attack, the idea of an original Hexateuch was discussed once again.¹⁰⁰

2.3. Theories about the Evolution of Israel's Religious Ideas

Bibliography: C. P. W. GRAMBERG, *Kritische Geschichte der Religionsideen des Alten Testaments*, 1. *Hierarchie und Cultus*; 2. *Theokratie und Prophetismus* (Berlin 1830). – J. F. L. GEORGE, *Die älteren jüdischen Feste, mit einer Kritik der Gesetzgebung des Pentateuch* (Berlin 1835). – L. PERLITT, *Vatke und Wellhausen: geschichtsphilosophische Voraussetzungen und historiographische Motive für die Darstellung der Religion und Geschichte Israels durch Wilhelm Vatke und Julius Wellhausen* (BZAW 94; Berlin 1965). – W. VATKE, *Die biblische Theologie wissenschaftlich dargestellt*, 1. *Die Religion des Alten Testaments* (Berlin 1835).

The elaboration of models to explain the formation of the Hebrew Bible and especially the Penta- or Hexateuch is closely related to ideas about the evolution of the Israelite religion.

Already de Wette was interested to reconstruct the evolution of ancient Israel

⁹⁶ *Theologie* (1873), 74–130.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.* 72.

⁹⁸ Particularly influential was G. VON RAD, "Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch (1938)", repr. *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament* (ThB 8; Munich 1971), 9–86; ET: "The Form Critical Problem of the Hexateuch", *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Edinburgh 1965), 1–78.

⁹⁹ M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (1943) (Darmstadt 1967); ET: *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOT.S 15; Sheffield 1991).

¹⁰⁰ See on this question: T. RÖMER, "How Many Books (teuchs): Pentateuch, Hexateuch, Deuteronomistic History, or Enneateuch?", *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch? Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (ed. T. B. Dozeman / T. Römer / K. Schmid; AIL 8; Atlanta, GA 2011), 25–42.

and its transition from "Hebraism" to "Judaism".¹⁰¹ Carl Peter Wilhelm Gramberg (1797–1830),¹⁰² a student of Gesenius who was influenced by de Wette, distinguished seven periods in the development of the Old Testament religion in his *Critical History of the Religious Ideas of the Old Testament* (*Kritische Geschichte der Religionsideen des Alten Testaments*, a work that he was not able to finish because of his early death).¹⁰³ The first period is reflected in the books of Genesis, Exodus, and Judges. These books, written in the time from David to Hezekiah, contain older oral sources and memories. The second period is represented by the books of Samuel and Ruth. They contain memories from the time of David but were written shortly before the Babylonian exile. The prophetic books of Isaiah 1–35*, Hosea, Joel and others originated in the eighth and seventh centuries and were reworked somewhat later. The books of Leviticus and Numbers and Prophets like Jeremiah and Ezekiel represent the fourth period; they were compiled at the beginning of the Babylonian exile. The fifth stage is reflected in books like Kings, Deuteronomy, Joshua and Isaiah 40–66 that were compiled at the end of the Babylonian or the beginning of the Persian period. The redactors of the books of Kings insist on the central sanctuary, therefore the edition of Kings must date from the same period as Deuteronomy.¹⁰⁴ Gramberg thus advocates an exilic or early post-exilic date for the book of Deuteronomy. Joshua also implies knowledge of Deuteronomy (see 8:30–35). The sixth period, reflected in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, Haggai etc. is the time of the return from exile. The seventh and last stage, that covers the time from the end of the Persian period to Antiochus Epiphanes, can be detected in the books of Chronicles, Esther and Daniel. Contrary to de Wette and others, Gramberg was not interested in correlating these periods to an overall philosophical or theological idea of the evolution of religion. In a way, he considered his schema of the seven stages as "neutral" (*unparteyisch*) and objective.¹⁰⁵

Johann Friedrich Leopold George (1811–1873)¹⁰⁶ in a study about the Israelite festivals made suggestions about the evolution of these festivals. He distinguished three main periods: an epic period, reflected by the narrative material of the Pentateuch; a lyrical period which can be detected in some of the legal material, especially in the book of Deuteronomy; finally the period of priestly hierarchy that developed after the Babylonian exile, reflected in the legal material from the books of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers.¹⁰⁷ Contrary to de Wette, George demonstrated that the legal material in Exodus–Numbers is later than the book of Deuteronomy and anticipated the idea that the "priestly" texts in the Pentateuch are post-Deuteronomistic.¹⁰⁸ George's three-step model of the evolution of

¹⁰¹ See above, 399.

¹⁰² See Rogerson, *OT Criticism* (1984), 57–63.

¹⁰³ *Geschichte*, I (1830), xxv–xxvi (summary of the position he wants to develop in several volumes dealing with cult, political organization, prophecy, religious and ethical concepts).

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 146–47.

¹⁰⁵ *Geschichte*, II (1830), iv. See also Gesenius, who wrote the Preface in vol. I, ix–xiii.

¹⁰⁶ For a biography see A. HÄCKERMANN, "George, Leopold", *ABD* 8 (1878), 710–721 = http://de.wikisource.org/wiki/ADB:George,_Leopold (22.6.2012).

¹⁰⁷ *Feste* (1835), 11–13.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 12: *so haben wir in dem Deuteronomium die erste Zusammenfassung dieses allmählig Entwickelten. Nach dem Exil aber gab die Erneuerung der gottesdienstlichen Verfassung und die*

the Israelite religion, which tends toward centralization and priestly control, anticipates in an astonishing way Wellhausen's model,¹⁰⁹ in which J/E, D and P represent similar periods.

Unfortunately, George's work was overshadowed by Wilhelm Vatke's *Biblical Theology*, which was published in the same year and received a much broader reception, both positive and negative.¹¹⁰ Vatke (1806–1882)¹¹¹ was strongly influenced by Hegelian philosophy,¹¹² which he exploited for an understanding of the evolution of the Israelite faith and religion by applying the idea of development according to which religion moves from the lower to the higher; yet he also based his thinking on de Wette, Gesenius and Gramberg.¹¹³ Like the latter, Vatke divided the history of the Israelite religion into several periods, following the *Entwicklung der Alttestamentlichen Religion nach den kanonischen Büchern des A. T.*:¹¹⁴ the time of Moses, the period of the Judges, the time of David and Solomon, the tenth and ninth centuries, the Assyrian era, the Chaldean era, the Persian period, the Macedonian and Maccabean era. These titles show that, for Vatke, historical information about the Israelite religion of some certainty is available only from the ninth century, even if there are historical reminiscences from the time of Moses¹¹⁵ and the Judges. The time of the Judges corresponds to the transition from a nomadic to a settled lifestyle; the cult of Yahweh was simple and combined with the worship of other deities. Yhwh even received human sacrifices, a custom that continued during the monarchic period. The entire period up to the Assyrian era is characterized by polytheism and rudimentary ethics. Josiah's reform, which was not based on Deuteronomy that was written later,¹¹⁶ represents a first step toward a more prophetic and ethical religion. The destruction of Jerusalem and the Babylonian exile trigger the transformation of "Hebraism" to "Judaism".¹¹⁷ The laws and the cult are attributed to Moses, and new doctrines like that of resurrection emerge due to the contact with Babylonian and Persian beliefs. Vatke considers the Persian period as the *Blüte der Alttestamentlichen Religion*;¹¹⁸ only the emergence of the *späteren Judenthum*, represented by the Sadduceans and Phariseans, brought the unity of the Old Tes-

Umgestaltung der Verhältnisse noch mehr Anlaß für die Gesetzgebung, und so wurden die früheren Bemühungen fortgesetzt in den Büchern Leviticus und Numeri. Und auch Exodus wurde durch Stücke vermehrt, die dieser Zeit angehören.

¹⁰⁹ On the question of a direct influence see Rogerson, *OT Criticism* (1984), 64.

¹¹⁰ Because of the intervention of Hengstenberg, Vatke never received a full professorship and was hindered to complete his *Theology* of which only the first volume appeared.

¹¹¹ C. BULTMANN, "Vatke, Wilhelm", *TRE* 34 (2002), 552–555.

¹¹² On this question see especially Peritt, Vatke, and also KRAUS, *Geschichte* (1982), 189–99.

¹¹³ According to Rogerson, *OT Criticism* (1984), 71, "de Wette is referred to more than any other scholar".

¹¹⁴ *Theologie* (1835), 177–599.

¹¹⁵ The Patriarchal narratives only inform us that the Israelites were at the beginnings "rough nomads" worshipping stars and planets (*Theologie*, 184–185). They were not put down in writing before the time of the monarchy (455).

¹¹⁶ *Theologie* (1835), 505.

¹¹⁷ It may be noted, however, that for Vatke Judaism is the result of a long evolution, and a "strict separation" (*strenge Scheidung*) between Hebraism and Judaism seems impossible to him (*Theologie*, 551).

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.* 566.

tament to an end.¹¹⁹ Interestingly, although he considers the Judaism of the Roman period as the end of true Old Testament religion, Vatke does not adopt a theory of decadence and degeneration. On the contrary, its apotheosis occurs in the Persian period. In this regard, Vatke's view differs from de Wette's, Gramberg's and especially Wellhausen's, even if the latter refers to Vatke's work as the most important contribution to the understanding of the history of Israel.¹²⁰ Vatke's book received – for different reasons – more critical than positive comments.¹²¹ His emphasis on the Persian period, however, anticipated a trend in present Hebrew Bible scholarship.

The literary models explaining the formation of the Pentateuch that were developed during the nineteenth century were all, in a sense, related to ideas and theories about the evolution of the Israelite religion and its transformation into Judaism.

2.4. Three Main Models to Explain the Formation of the Pentateuch: Fragment Hypothesis, Supplementary Hypothesis and Documentary Hypothesis

Bibliography: F. BLEEK, *De libri Geneseos origine atque indole historica observationes quaedam contra Bohlenium* (Bonn 1836). – T. K. CHEYNE, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism. Biographical, Descriptive and Critical Studies* (London 1893; repr. Jerusalem 1971). – J. W. COLENSO, *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined*, 1–7 (London 1862–1879). – W. M. L. DE WETTE, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphen Bücher des Alten Testaments (neu bearbeitet von E. Schrader)* (Berlin 1869). – A. T. HARTMANN, *Historisch-kritische Forschungen über die Bildung, das Zeitalter und den Plan der fünf Bücher Mose's* (Rostock 1831). – H. HUPFELD, *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung von neuem untersucht* (Berlin 1853). – K. D. ILGEN, *Die Urkunden des jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt*, 1. *Die Urkunden des ersten Buchs von Moses in ihrer Urgestalt* (Halle 1798). – A. KNOBEL, *Die Genesis* (KEHAT 11; Leipzig 1852). – E. RIEHM, *Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab. Ein Beitrag zur Einleitung in's Alte Testament* (Gotha 1854). – B. SEIDEL, *Karl David Ilgen und die Pentateuchforschung im Umkreis der sogenannten Älteren Urkundenhypothese: Studien zur Geschichte der exegetischen Hermeneutik in der Späten Aufklärung* (BZAW 213; Berlin / New York 1993). – F. TUCH, *Kommentar über die Genesis* (Halle 1838). – J. VAN SETERS, *The Edited Bible. The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake, IN 2006).

¹¹⁹ Ibid. 579

¹²⁰ J. WELLHAUSEN, *Geschichte Israels*, 1 (Berlin 1878), 4. In a letter of condolence, Wellhausen speaks of Vatke as the man from whom he had learnt the most, although he was a Hegelian (Perlitt, Vatke, 1965, 152).

¹²¹ For the reactions of Hengstenberg, Nitzsch, Ewald and de Wette see Perlitt, Vatke (1965), 132–143. On the Jewish side, Salomon Ludwig Steinheim (1789–1866) wrote an entire book directed against Vatke, in 1840: S. L. STEINHEIM, *Die Offenbarung vom Standpunkte der höheren Kritik. Eine Prüfung der Darstellung des Herrn Professors W. Vatke in seiner Schrift: "Die Religion des Alten Testaments nach den kanonischen Büchern entwickelt"* (Kiel 1840), in which he appears, according to HaCohen, to be the "first Jewish thinker to explicitly point out the Christian bias in modern biblical criticism [...]. Interestingly, Steinheim identified the Christian bias of this approach specifically in the work of Vatke, who was not hostile toward the Law as so many other Christian scholars", *Reclaiming* (2010), 112–113.

Authors of "introductions to the Old Testament", when dealing with the history of Pentateuchal research, present three literary models to explain the formation of the first five books of the Bible, which emerged mainly in the nineteenth century and which were in competition: the documentary hypothesis, the supplementary hypothesis and the fragment hypothesis. The documentary hypothesis, which originated with Astruc and Witter already, postulates that the Pentateuch is the result of the combination of two or more documents that were originally independent from each other and that were put together by one or more redactor(s) in order to form the Pentateuch¹²² in its present form.¹²³ The supplementary hypothesis considers that at the origin of the Pentateuch there was a narrative, which extended from the origins to Moses' death or the conquest; later hands subsequently inserted complements or fragments from other traditions. The fragment hypothesis regards the Pentateuch as the result of the combination of several fragments. The narrative frame of the Pentateuch is not original, it is the result of the combination of originally independent texts stemming from different traditions.

One often tries to classify the great names of nineteenth-century Pentateuch research based on their adherence to one of these three models, but this classification seems rather artificial. First, most scholars, beginning with de Wette, changed their minds in the course of time and, second, they often combined aspects from two or three of these hypotheses. This can already be observed for Astruc, who postulated that the two "memoires" A and B had been supplemented by an important number of fragments. It is also the case of Carl David Ilgen (1763–1834),¹²⁴ professor at the University of Jena which he left in 1802 for rather unclear reasons.¹²⁵ In his book on the documents of the Jerusalemite Temple archive of which only the first volume (dealing with the book of Genesis) appeared, Ilgen comes to the conclusion that the book of Genesis results from the compilation of 17 documents which were written down by three separate authors; two Elohist and one Jehovistic author. The first Elohist author (whom he calls "Sopher Eliel harishon") wrote ten documents, the second Elohist author ("Sopher Eliel hashsheni") five and the Jehovistic author ("Sopher Eliyah harishon") two. Ilgen leaves the dating of these three documents to further investigation, which has never been carried out.¹²⁶ A redactor combined these documents and, in doing so, truncated them in order to realize his compila-

¹²² For commodity, we will use the term "Pentateuch", although many scholars imagine in fact an original Hexateuch, as shown above.

¹²³ In order to illustrate this hypothesis, scholars often quote the Diatessaron, the Gospel harmony, created in the second century by Tatian, see, for instance, G. F. MOORE, "Tatian's Diatessaron and the Analysis of the Pentateuch", *JBL* 9 (1890) 201–215, and H. DONNER, "Der Redaktor. Überlegungen zum vorkritischen Umgang mit der Heiligen Schrift", *Henoah* 2 (1980) 1–30.

¹²⁴ For his biography see Seidel, Ilgen (1993), 68–91, who provides further bibliographical references.

¹²⁵ According to Seidel, *ibid.* 90–92, the University of Jena was known for paying bad salaries to its professors, which is why Ilgen probably left for financial reasons.

¹²⁶ He insists on the idea that we should not look for the historical Moses whom we do not know, but concentrate on the "kerygmatic Moses"; he also thinks that the Pentateuch must have been edited before 285 (manuscript of his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, quoted by Seidel, Ilgen, 1993, 172–173).

tion. Yet this *Sammler* is not an author, but only a compiler¹²⁷. Ilgen's rather complicated theory that did not find much support is nevertheless an interesting combination of the documentary and the fragmentary hypotheses.

Protagonists of the fragmentary hypothesis (the initiator of which is often said to be Alexander Geddes¹²⁸) often acknowledged that the fragments were already combined in one way or another before redactors brought them together. In his early works, de Wette, influenced by Vater, accepted the idea that the Pentateuch is composed of an important number of fragments.¹²⁹ Yet these fragments had been incorporated into a basic framework.¹³⁰ Anton Theodor Hartmann (1774–1838), professor of theology at the University of Rostock, defended the fragmentary hypothesis, criticizing Astruc, Ilgen and others, who used the divine names “Elohim” and “Jehova” (the common spelling of the *tetragrammaton* in the first half of the nineteenth century).¹³¹ He also seems to suggest a different development of the book of Genesis compared to the other four books of the Pentateuch; he insists on the *Ungleichartigkeit der schriftlichen Urkunden und die Verschiedenheit der Verfasser* in the different books of the Pentateuch (p.239). However, his long and often polemical analysis does not offer a clear model of the compilation of these different documents.

Heinrich Ewald (1803–1875)¹³² is often said to be the pioneer of the supplementary hypothesis. In a way, he had a forerunner in de Wette, who in his *Beiträge* postulated the existence of a Hebrew national epic, covering the narrative from Genesis 1 to Exodus 20, which was later supplemented by different fragments. Ewald, professor in Göttingen and the teacher of Wellhausen – who, however, had a rather ambiguous opinion of his professor¹³³ – was very passionate about his scholarly and political convictions.¹³⁴ As outlined above (Sect. 2.2.) he also changed his views on the formation of the Pentateuch more than just once. In his review of Stähelin's book, he does not really postulate a Supplementary hypothesis.¹³⁵ The base document of the Hexateuch, according to him, was

¹²⁷ *Urkunden* (1798), 344.

¹²⁸ See, however, J. W. ROGERSON, “Was Geddes a ‘Fragmentist’? In Search of the ‘Geddes-Vater Hypothesis’”, *The Bible and the Enlightenment. A Case Study – Dr Alexander Geddes (1737–1802)* (ed. W. Johnstone; JSOT.S 377; London / New York 2004), 157–167, who claims that Geddes never developed a clear theory, by postulating small units of oral tradition and claiming that they were written down only much later. According to VAN SETERS, *Edited Bible* (2006), 202, J.S. Vater should be considered the founder of the fragmentary hypothesis.

¹²⁹ *Beiträge*, II (1807 / 1971), 311.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.* 29.

¹³¹ *Forschungen* (1831), 86–99.

¹³² For biographical information see CHEYNE, *Founders* (1893), 66–118; L. PERLITT, “Heinrich Ewald. Der Gelehrte in der Politik”, in: *Theologie in Göttingen, eine Vorlesungsreihe* (ed. B. Müller; Göttingen 1987), 157–212; Rogerson, *OT Criticism* (1984), 91–103.

¹³³ In J. WELLHAUSEN, “Heinrich Ewald (1901)”, in: *Grundrisse zum Alten Testament* (ThB 27; Munich 1965), 120–138, he describes him as being a major obstacle to progress in biblical research, as made by Wette and Vatke (131–32), and as a teacher without pedagogical skills, who presented the results of his own research without any further arguments (120).

¹³⁴ He belonged to the “Seven of Göttingen” who in 1837 protested against King August, who suspended the liberal constitution of Hanover. In 1867, when Göttingen became Prussian, he refused the loyalty oath to the Prussian king and was deprived of the *venia legendi*. In 1874, he was imprisoned for three weeks for having insulted Otto von Bismarck.

¹³⁵ Ewald, *Review of Stähelin* (see 2.2.).

an "Elohistic document" which was combined with a "Jehovistic document"; the redactor used the Elohist document as a basis to which he added fragments from the Jehovistic document. Ewald was not sure, however, whether the Jehovist, the author of the Jehovistic document, edited the Elohist base narrative (*Grundschrift*). According to that model, there was only one narrative that one or more redactor(s) supplemented. While Ewald, in 1831, remained close to the assumptions of the classical documentary hypothesis,¹³⁶ other scholars elaborated a more precise supplementary hypothesis.

Friedrich Bleek (1793–1859) and Friedrich Tuch (1806–1867), criticizing both the fragmentary hypothesis¹³⁷ and the documentary hypothesis, developed the idea of one "document" and one "Supplementer" (*Ergänzer*). For Tuch,¹³⁸ the Jehovist was clearly the redactor of the *Elohimquelle*,¹³⁹ and the Pentateuch, with the exception of the book of Deuteronomy, was the result of this Jehovistic reworking.¹⁴⁰ August Knobel advocated the same position: The Elohist document had been edited by the Jehovist, who may also have had written documents and oral traditions at his disposal.¹⁴¹ This relatively simple model (one narrative, one reviser and the book of Deuteronomy) has recently been defended by J. Van Seters according to whom a Jahwistic History was supplemented by a priestly redactor, who also inserted the book of Deuteronomy.¹⁴²

The initiator of the so-called "newer documentary hypothesis" (in opposition to the "older" documentary hypothesis that postulated the existence of only two parallel documents) was probably Hermann Hupfeld (1796–1866), professor in Marburg and later successor of Gesenius in Halle.¹⁴³ In his book *The Sources of Genesis and the Manner of Their Conflation* (*Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung*, 1853), he tried to demonstrate that within the "Elohistic texts" one has to distinguish two documents: the older Elohist source (*Urschrift*),¹⁴⁴ which contains the narrative reaching from the origins of the world to the conquest of the land, and a second Elohist source, which contains mainly the patriarchal narratives.¹⁴⁵ The third and youngest document is the "Jhivistic"¹⁴⁶ source.¹⁴⁷ These three sources were all originally independent and

¹³⁶ Houtman, *Pentateuch* (1994), 94–95.

¹³⁷ Bleek's book is a refutation of Peter von Bohlen, an advocate of the fragmentary hypothesis.

¹³⁸ *Genesis* (1838), LI–XCVIII.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.* LXV, LXXVIII.

¹⁴⁰ A conservative variant of the supplementary hypothesis can be found in FRANZ DELITZSCH, *Die Genesis* (Leipzig, 21853), who situates the Jehovistic redactor in the time of Joshua. In the fifth edition of his commentary, he adopted the documentary hypothesis. For an intellectual biography see S. WAGNER, *Franz Delitzsch. Leben und Werk* (Munich 1978; 21991).

¹⁴¹ Knobel, *Genesis* (1852), XIII: *Dabei ist er theils anderen älteren Schriften, welche ihm als Quelle dienten [...], theils der im Volke geltenden Sage [...], theils seiner eigenen Voraussetzung und Vermuthung gefolgt.*

¹⁴² See, for instance, J. VAN SETERS, *The Pentateuch. A Social Science Commentary* (Trajectories; Sheffield 1999).

¹⁴³ On Hupfeld see CHEYNE, *Founders* (1893), 149–155; Rogerson, *OT Criticism* (1984), 131–34; O. KAISER, *Zwischen Reaktion und Revolution: Hermann Hupfeld (1796–1866) – ein deutsches Professorenleben* (AAWG. Ph.-H. Klasse, III/268; Göttingen 2005).

¹⁴⁴ *Quellen* (1853), 6–38.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 38–56, 167–95.

¹⁴⁶ Hupfeld uses this term, close to the *tetragrammaton*, instead of the common "Jehovist".

¹⁴⁷ *Quellen* (1853), 56–79, 101–67.

were brought together by a redactor¹⁴⁸ who acted “in strict fidelity” and “inserted his sources verbatim and in full and brought them together retaining all of their peculiarities”, but who also paid attention to the “overall structure of the narrative in order to avoid obvious repetitions or contradictions [...] reproducing on an expanded scale in the complete work the (epic) plan of the history inhering in the sources”.¹⁴⁹ With the support of his student Eduard Riehm (1830–1888)¹⁵⁰ – who, in a monograph, dated the book of Deuteronomy to the time of Manasseh¹⁵¹ and described its intention as a modernization of the ancient Law – Hupfeld opened the way to the four-document hypothesis. By frequently using the term “Deuteronomist”, Riehm shaped the idea that Deuteronomy could be considered a fourth document, completing the three sources identified by Hupfeld; and Hupfeld’s distinction of two “Elohists” prepared the later distinction between a priestly source (Hupfeld’s *Urschrift* of the Pentateuch) and a (more fragmentary) Elohist source. However, the combination of different models remained common among scholars. Even Hupfeld admitted that some cases – as, for instance, the tribal list in Genesis 29–30 – can best be explained with a supplementary hypothesis.¹⁵²

A combination of models is also advocated by the older de Wette or better by his reviser, Schrader. In the eighth edition of his critical introduction (revised by Schrader), we read¹⁵³ that the right insight into the formation of the Pentateuch can only be gained through a combination of all three hypotheses, “especially the combination of the documentary and the supplementary hypothesis, in imagining that the Hexateuch (Gen 1–Josh 24) originated from two main documents: the document of the annalistic narrator and the document of the theocratic narrator. A third one, the prophetic narrator, combined those, not only in putting them together, but also [...] by adding texts stemming either from written documents or from oral tradition”.¹⁵⁴ Similarly, John William Colenso accepted the idea that a younger Elohist should be distinguished from the main Elohist; yet the younger Elohist (which he identified with the Jehovist) and the Jehovist (which he labelled Second Jehovist) should not be considered to be independent documents, but supplements to the first Elohist.¹⁵⁵ Colenso also thought that one should distinguish at least four stages in the work of the Jehovist, which reminds of Wellhausen’s idea that J should be split into J¹, J², J³, etc.

A close examination of nineteenth-century Pentateuchal research reveals that until the victory of the Kuenen-Wellhausen model, scholars tended to combine ideas and observations from the three explanatory models available to them.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 195–213.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 196. English translation taken from Van Seters, *Edited Bible* (1999), 222. According to him, Hupfeld based himself on the model of the “edited” Homeric epic and had in mind “a historian who is editing his sources in a diplomatic style [...] it is this earliest description of the function of the Pentateuchal redactor that has persisted throughout its subsequent use” (222).

¹⁵⁰ For the importance of Riehm, see Kaiser, Hupfeld (2005), 225–231.

¹⁵¹ *Gesetzgebung* (1854), 96–105.

¹⁵² *Quellen* (1853), 43–44.

¹⁵³ This statement may indeed come from Schrader, who indicates in the foreword, that he has entirely revised the paragraphs on the formation of the Pentateuch: *Lehrbuch* (1817), VIII–IX.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 313.

¹⁵⁵ *Pentateuch*, Pt. 5, 180–183. On his model see also Rogerson, *OT Criticism* (1984), 228–237.

3. Critical Investigation on the Formation of the Former and Latter Prophets

3.1. *The theory of Deuteronomistic Redactions in the Books of Joshua – Kings*

Bibliography: H. AUSLOOS, "John William Colenso (1814–1883) and the Deuteronomist", *RB* 113 (2006) 372–397. – H. EWALD, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus*, 6 vols (Göttingen 1843–1859; 1883); ET: *History of Israel* (London 1867–1886). – T. RÖMER / A. DE PURY, "Deuteronomistic Historiography (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues", *Israel Constructs Its History. Deuteronomistic History in Recent Research* (ed. A. de Pury / T. Römer / J.-D. Macchi; JSOT.S 306; Sheffield 2000), 24–141.

As we have pointed out, de Wette had recognized the Deuteronomistic character of the book of Joshua,¹⁵⁶ thus preparing the idea of "Deuteronomistic" redactions elsewhere in the Pentateuch or in the Former Prophets.¹⁵⁷ The idea of "Deuteronomism" was taken further by H. Ewald in his *History of Israel*. We have seen that he advocated a Hexateuch by postulating a "Great Book of Origins" (Genesis – Joshua). He considered the following books, Judges – Kings, as having constituted the "Great Book of Kings". This "book" contained different documents from the time of Saul and the monarchy, and was compiled in accordance with "Deuteronomic ideas" (*deuteronomische Ansichten*).¹⁵⁸ 1 Samuel 12 shows that this Deuteronomic editor must still have worked in the time of the Davidic monarchy, and the period of Josiah offers a plausible setting. This "last but one" (*vorletzter*) editor was followed by the final, a second Deuteronomic editor who revised the older edition during the second half of the Babylonian exile: "one final author or collector edited the present Books of Judges, Ruth, Samuel and Kings as a whole".¹⁵⁹ This exilic editor sets out to answer the question why the people had to undergo the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile. Interestingly, Martin Noth was to conceive the project of the Deuteronomist in similar terms.

But Ewald also admitted a Deuteronomistic reworking of the "Great Book of Origins" and attributed it to the sixth stage of the edition of Genesis – Joshua. The work of this Deuteronomist, who wrote at the time of Josiah, corresponds largely to the book of Deuteronomy, as well as much of Joshua (this is probably due to de Wette's influence). This redactor knew the books of Genesis – Numbers, too, and "he also drew largely upon many documents, both of a narrative and a legislative character, which are now entirely lost".¹⁶⁰ The work of the Deuteronomist, responsible for the editing of Deuteronomy and Joshua, was linked

¹⁵⁶ Beiträge, I, 137, n. 2

¹⁵⁷ Kraus, *Geschichte*, 176.

¹⁵⁸ *History I*, 133–168.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 160

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 125–126. According to Van Seters, *Edited Bible*, the idea of widespread literacy and the collection of ancient works is an "unconscious anachronism reflecting the influence of the Renaissance and early modern period" (217).

with the books of Genesis – Exodus (compiled by the fifth narrator¹⁶¹) by the last compiler and editor of the Hexateuch, whose fundamental contribution was to conflate documents: “He left the work of the Fifth narrator exactly as he found it, up to the section, shortly before the death of Moses, to which the chief portion of the Deuteronomist’s work could suitably be attached. But since the latter ... had written the life of Joshua very briefly, the editor proceeded, after the death of Moses on a freer plan, uniting the more detailed narrative given by the older work with the essential contents of the Deuteronomist’s, and so blending the two works completely into one. It was certainly this last editor who inserted the Blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxiii).”¹⁶² In speaking of a last editor of the Hexateuch, Ewald anticipated the idea of a last redaction of the Penta- or Hexateuch, which in current scholarship plays an important role yet again.¹⁶³

Curiously, Ewald sharply distinguished between the two Deuteronomists of the Hexateuch (the sixth narrator and the final editor) and the two Deuteronomists (from the time of Josiah and the time of the Babylonian exile) of the books of Judges. Ewald realized that Judg 2:6–23, stemming from the exilic Deuteronomists, opens with a passage (2:6–10) parallel to Josh 24:28–33. He conceded that this passage constituted a link of a sort, yet he did not admit the idea of an Enneateuch, or the idea that the exilic editor of the “Great Book of Kings” might have wished to join his work to the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua.¹⁶⁴ Although his ideas of the relation between Gen – Josh and Judg – Kgs remain somewhat unclear, Ewald anticipated a trend in Deuteronomistic research: Wellhausen adopted the idea of a Josianic Deuteronomistic edition of the books of Samuel and Kings,¹⁶⁵ and scholarship in the second part of the twentieth century was strongly influenced by the work of Frank Moore Cross, who advocated the double redaction of the Deuteronomistic History, with the same dating (Josianic and exilic) as Ewald¹⁶⁶ and made it the major explanatory model for the formation of the Prophets in North America until today.¹⁶⁷

Another major player in the research on Deuteronomism is John William Colenso (1814–1883), the first Anglican Bishop of Natal in the British Colony of South Africa where he protested against the treatment of the native population by British authorities. His refusal to teach the doctrine of hell and eternal damna-

¹⁶¹ Who precedes the sixth narrator, the Deuteronomist, and resembles Wellhausen’s “Jehovist” (the compiler of J and E).

¹⁶² History, I, 130.

¹⁶³ T. RÖMER / K. SCHMID (eds.), *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l’Hexateuque et de l’Ennéateuque* (BETHL 203; Leuven 2007).

¹⁶⁴ For more details on Ewald’s view about the relation of the Deuteronomistic editions of Gen – Josh and Judg – Kgs, see Römer / de Pury, *Deuteronomistic Historiography* (2000), 35–38.

¹⁶⁵ J. WELHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin 1899; repr. 1963), 262–263. Contrary to Ewald, Wellhausen is not sure whether the Deuteronomistic redactions in Samuel and Kings belonged to the same editors, but he thinks that this question is not relevant (“gleichgiltig”, p. 301).

¹⁶⁶ F. M. CROSS, “The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History”, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA 1973), 274–289.

¹⁶⁷ Van Seters, *Edited Bible*, 220, points out that the very conservative position of Ewald, who insisted on the historical value of the traditions of his two “Great Books”, found a successor in William F. Albright and his school.

tion to newly converted Christians led him to re-examine the Bible and propose highly critical results. His publications on the Pentateuch and Joshua sparked strong reactions in England, with opponents to his theories attempting to defend the historical reliability of the first books of the Bible.¹⁶⁸

In the six volumes of his publication, Colenso was one of the first to systematize the question of a Deuteronomistic edition of the Hexateuch. In Part III, he distinguished the original edition of the Book of Deuteronomy, which he (like others) thought to have been written by the prophet Jeremiah¹⁶⁹ and which he dated to the time of Josiah, from later additions to the book made by the Deuteronomist. Colenso also listed expressions in Deuteronomy used by the Deuteronomist but not occurring in the first books of the Pentateuch.¹⁷⁰ He argued, on the basis of linguistic evidence, that the books of a Genesis – Numbers also underwent a redaction by the exilic Deuteronomist.¹⁷¹ Those Deuteronomistic passages are “smaller ones in Genesis, but longer ones in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Joshua”.¹⁷²

The question of the existence of one or more Deuteronomistic redactions of the Pentateuch has been discussed again since the 1970s, leading numerous scholars to abandon the documentary hypothesis as it was held by Kuenen and Wellhausen, because it was unable to explain the “Deuteronomistic” elements in the Tetrteuch.¹⁷³

3.2. Source and Redaction Criticism in the Latter Prophets

Bibliography: U. BECKER, “Der Jesaja-Kommentar von Wilhelm Gesenius”, *Biblische Exegese und hebräische Lexikographie. Das ‘Hebräisch-deutsche Handwörterbuch’ von Wilhelm Gesenius als Spiegel und Quelle alttestamentlicher und hebräischer Forschung, 200 Jahre nach seiner ersten Auflage* (ed. S. Schorch / E.-J. Waschke; BZAW 427; Berlin/Boston, forthcoming). – B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja* (HKAT III/1; Göttingen 1892); *Das Buch Jeremia* (KHC.AT XI; Tübingen, Leipzig 1901). – H. EWALD, *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes*, 2 vols (Stuttgart 1840–1841; ²1867). – F. H. W. GESENIUS, *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über den Jesaja*, 2 vols (Leipzig 1821; ²1829).

The question of a Deuteronomistic redaction began to concern also the treatment of the Prophetic books, especially the book of Jeremiah. The links between the book of Jeremiah and the Deuteronomistic passages in the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets, as observed by Colenso and others, received a redaction-critical explanation in Bernhard Duhm’s (1847–1928)¹⁷⁴ commentary of 1901. In this

¹⁶⁸ J. A. DRAPER (ed.), *The Eye of the Storm: Bishop John William Colenso and the Crisis of Biblical Inspiration* (JSOT.S 386; London 2003).

¹⁶⁹ Pentateuch III, 410. See also Pentateuch I, 367. This idea is based on the right observation that the Deuteronomistic style also occurs in the book of Jeremiah. This should probably be explained by the theory of a Deuteronomistic redaction of the book of Jeremiah (see below).

¹⁷⁰ Pentateuch, III, 402.

¹⁷¹ See on this Ausloos, Colenso (2006), who provides a useful list of all the texts that Colenso considered to be “Deuteronomistic”.

¹⁷² Pentateuch, I, 367. The observation, that Genesis is much less “Deuteronomistic” than Exodus and Numbers plays a major role in present Pentateuchal research as well.

¹⁷³ See on this de Pury / Römer, *Pentateuque en question* (1991), 48–50, 58–62.

¹⁷⁴ On Duhm see Smend, *Alttestamentler*, 114–128.

commentary, Duhm attributed no more than some 60 brief oracles to the historical Jeremiah. He then postulated the existence of a "biography of Jeremiah" in Jer 26–29 and 32–45. The main parts of the book (about 850 verses) are due to Deuteronomistic reworking,¹⁷⁵ which can easily be recognized by their style, including repetitions and theological platitudes.¹⁷⁶ Duhm postulated that "the book has slowly expanded, like a forest growing wildly",¹⁷⁷ and that the Deuteronomistic scribes, whom he did not like very much (sometimes he refers to them as "Pharisees"), worked on the book from the Babylonian to the Maccabean period. In a way, Duhm's commentary presents the achievements of the critical analysis of the Prophetic books in the nineteenth century.

Nineteenth-century biblical scholarship on the Prophets was mainly characterized by the search for the *ipsisima verba* of the Prophets, as well as by the idealistic and Protestant concept of the prophets representing a spiritual and ethic religion. The commentary on the book of Isaiah by Wilhelm Gesenius (the first part of which was published 1820) is exceptional in this context, as Gesenius showed himself to be more interested in philological and historical questions. As pointed out by U. Becker, Gesenius wished to contribute with this work to a profane reconstruction of Jewish history, by adopting a "comparative" approach.¹⁷⁸ Although Gesenius himself was more interested in "lower" criticism, his commentary contributed decisively to the "higher criticism" of the book. He accepted the fact that chapters 40–66 are not to be attributed to the prophet of the eighth century.¹⁷⁹ But in Proto-Isaiah, numerous passages are also due to later authors: Isaiah 13–14; 21; 24–27; 34–35; 36–39.¹⁸⁰ Chapters 24–27 clearly indicate the historical context in which they were composed, which is the end of the Babylonian period: *Das Land Juda und Jerusalem sind verwüstet (24,1–12. 27,10,11), die Juden zerstreut (24,14–16). Der Sturz Babels steht aber als nahe bevor.*¹⁸¹ The book of Isaiah is the result of the compilation of smaller collections¹⁸² that were all attributed to the prophet. A first collection from the time of the exilic period ended in chapter 35, to which chapters 36–39 (excerpted

¹⁷⁵ The idea that the book of Jeremiah grew in three main stages, "Jeremiah" – "Baruch" – "Redactor", can also be found in the commentary of F. GIESEBRECHT, *Das Buch Jeremia und die Klagelieder Jeremiae* (HKAT III/2; Göttingen 1894; ²1907).

¹⁷⁶ See for instance his comments on the passage of the new covenant in Jer 31:31–34.

¹⁷⁷ Jeremia (1901), xx.

¹⁷⁸ Becker, "Gesenius", manuscript, p. 3. I would like to thank my colleague for having permitted the use of his manuscript before publication.

¹⁷⁹ The theory of a "Second Isaiah" emerged in the eighteenth century in the works of Döderlein (1775) and Eichhorn (1783) quoted by Gesenius, *Jesaja* (1821) I, 17. It was still refuted in the second half of the nineteenth century by F. Delitzsch, *Biblischer Commentar über den Prophet Jesaja* (Leipzig 1866); ET: *Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah* (Edinburgh 1867).

¹⁸⁰ *Jesaja*, I, 16–17. Gesenius mainly wants to distinguish two authors and attributes chapters 13–14; 21; 24–27; 34–35 to a "Pseudo-Isaiah". Contrary to many of his colleagues, Gesenius did not express a negative view on the later additions to the book, which belong (especially chapters 40–55) to the "most important and attractive passages of the Old Testament" (*Jesaja*, II (1829), 1; see Becker, "Gesenius", 4).

¹⁸¹ *Jesaja*, I, 757.

¹⁸² Gesenius (*Jesaja* I, 18–23) distinguishes four books: 1–12 (mostly authentic oracles); 13–23 (oracles against the nations with some non-authentic interpolations); 24–35 (authentic oracles from the time of Hezekiah in 28–33, framed by passages from the exilic period: 24–27 and 34–35, to which a "collector" added 36–39 from the books of Kings), 40–66 (added to the book only in postexilic times).

from the books of Kings) were added to conclude the book (in the same way as Jeremiah 52, which is also a summary taken from Kings).¹⁸³ Chapters 40–66 were added to the book of Isaiah only later, probably in the Persian period.¹⁸⁴ Gesenius anticipated numerous developments, which were taken up by B. Duhm¹⁸⁵ at the end of the century as well as by many scholars in the twentieth century,¹⁸⁶ which makes his commentary a true milestone in the history of research on the Prophets.

Contrary to Isaiah and Jeremiah, the book of Ezekiel remained somewhat excluded from "higher criticism" in the nineteenth century, probably because of its relatively homogenous style. Ewald observed rightly that the formation of the book comprised several stages: chapters 40–48 were written later than the majority of the other texts (only 29:17–21 is later). Contrary to the other passages of the book, this vision of the new temple reflects a "*priesterliche-ängstliche Farbe ... und Gedanken ... die dem übrigen Buche völlig fremd sind*".¹⁸⁷ Nevertheless all the parts of the book were, despite their differences, written by Ezekiel, who was more of a writer than a prophet,¹⁸⁸ in different situations of his life. A notable exception is the Jewish scholar L. Zunz, who considered the book to be a pseudepigraph from the second half of the fifth century,¹⁸⁹ a position that was later adopted by Torrey and, more recently, by J. Becker and U. Feist.¹⁹⁰ Most of the redaction-critical work on the book of Ezekiel was carried out in the twentieth century, and the same holds true for the Twelve Minor Prophets. Ewald elaborated a theory on the formation of the Book of the Twelve.¹⁹¹ The

¹⁸³ Jesaja, I, 952–956.

¹⁸⁴ Gesenius advances an interesting argument: originally as attested in the Talmud, Isaiah stood after Jeremiah and Ezekiel, which were considered to be canonical earlier than Isaiah (Jesaja, I, 22–23 with footnote 38).

¹⁸⁵ In Jesaja (1892), 7–22, he distinguishes five main stages in the formation of the book: a first collection edited by the prophet himself, other collections added by his disciples, redactions during the exilic period, edition of a book of Isaiah in the fourth century BCE, final edition under the Hasmoneans.

¹⁸⁶ See the short summary in J. VERMEYLEN, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique. Isaïe, I–XXXV, miroir d'un demi-millénaire d'expérience religieuse en Israël* (Etudes bibliques, Paris 1977–1978), 4–30.

¹⁸⁷ Propheten, II (1841), 218.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid. 207. A similar view is defended by F. HITZIG, *Der Prophet Ezechiel* (KEHAT 8; Leipzig 1847), professor in Zürich, who also wrote commentaries on Jeremiah and the Twelve. With the exception of some glosses, the book was the result of Ezekiel's scribal skills (viii–xvi). In his edition of the Bible, E. Reuss held a similar view, admitting only minor glosses and scribal errors, see J. M. VINCENT, "Eduard Reuss' Auslegung des Ezechielbuches in La Bible", *Altes Testament. Forschung und Wirkung. Festschrift für Henning Graf Reventlow* (ed. P. Mommer / W. Thiel; Frankfurt/Main 1994), 369–382, 375–376.

¹⁸⁹ *Bibelkritisches* (1873), 226–233. In *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch entwickelt: ein Beytrag zur Alterthumskunde und biblischen Kritik zur Literatur- und Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin 1832; Frankfurt/Main 2 1892), 157–162, he advocated, followed by A. Geiger, the early Persian period.

¹⁹⁰ C. C. TORREY, *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches 18; New Haven/London 1930); J. BECKER, "Erwägungen zur ezechielschen Frage", *Künder des Wortes. FS J. Schreiner* (ed. L. Ruppert / P. Weimar / E. Zenger; Würzburg 1982), 137–149; U. FEIST, *Ezechiel: das literarische Problem des Buches forschungsgeschichtlich betrachtet* (BWANT 138; Stuttgart et al. 1995).

¹⁹¹ Propheten I, 60–62, and, more detailed, in the second edition of 1867, 74–82. See also J. WÖHRLE, *Der Abschluss des Zwölfprophetenbuches: buchübergreifende Redaktionsprozesse in den späten Sammlungen* (BZAW 389; Berlin/New York 2008), 2–3.

individual books of the Twelve, like Joel, Amos, etc., were, however, all written by the prophets themselves (with very few exceptions). “Higher Criticism” on the Prophets started in the nineteenth century with research carried out on Isaiah.

4. On the Way to Wellhausen: Reuss, Popper, Graf and the Invention of a Postmonarchic Priestly Document

Bibliography: K. BUDDÉ (ed.), *Eduard Reuss' Briefwechsel mit seinem Schüler und Freunde Karl Heinrich Graf: zur Hundertjahrfeier seiner Geburt* (Giessen 1904). – J. CONRAD, *Karl Heinrich Graf's Arbeit am Alten Testament. Studien zu einer wissenschaftlichen Biographie* (ed. U. Becker; BZAW 425; Berlin/Boston 2011). – K. H. GRAF, *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments: zwei historisch-kritische Untersuchungen* (Leipzig 1866); “Die sogenannte Grundschrift des Pentateuch”, *Archiv für die wissenschaftliche Erforschung des Alten Testaments* 1 (1869) 466–477. – J.-G. HEINTZ, “Edouard Reuss, Karl Heinrich Graf et le Pentateuque”, *RHPbR* 71 (1991) 443–457. – A. KAYSER, *Das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels und seine Erweiterungen* (Strasbourg 1874). – S. R. KÜLLING, *Zur Datierung der 'Genesis-P-Stücke', namentlich des Kapitels Genesis XVII* (Kampen 1964). – T. NÖLDEKE, *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments* (Kiel 1869). – J. POPPER, *Der biblische Bericht über die Stiftshütte: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Composition und Diaskeue des Pentateuch* (Leipzig 1862). – Y. SHAVIT / M. ERAN, *The Hebrew Bible Reborn. From Holy Scripture to the Book of Books: a History of Biblical Culture and the Battles over the Bible in Modern Judaism* (Studia Judaica 38; Berlin/New York 2007). – R. J. THOMPSON, *Moses and the Law in a Century of Criticism since Graf* (VT.S 19; Leiden 1970). – J. M. VINCENT, *Leben und Werk des frühen Eduard Reuss: ein Beitrag zu den geistesgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen der Bibelkritik im zweiten Viertel des 19. Jahrhunderts* (BEvTh. 106; Munich 1990).

The documentary hypothesis and the supplementary hypothesis postulated an Elohist document that formed the basis of the Penta- or Hexateuch (*Grundschrift*) and two which belonged to “priestly” texts like the construction of the sanctuary in the second part of the book of Exodus, ritual laws in the book of Leviticus, but also texts like the institution of circumcision (Gen 17) or the Sabbath (Exod 16). Hupfeld’s idea that the Elohist document should be split into two independent sources did not change his view that the oldest document contained priestly legislation (see above).

The idea that the “priestly” laws and narratives are later than the oldest document of the Pentateuch was brought forward by Edouard Guillaume Eugène Reuss (1804–1891),¹⁹² professor at Strasbourg, and Karl Heinrich Graf (1815–1869), his student, who never obtained a chair and worked as a teacher of French and Hebrew in Meissen.¹⁹³ During his entire life Graf remained very close to Reuss as attested by the abundant correspondence between the two. Reuss claimed that he had come up with the idea that the Law was later than the Prophets as early as 1833, and that he had made it public in his lectures of 1834, but that he had refrained from publishing it because it was contradictory to the exe-

¹⁹² Reuss studied in Germany and his teachers were Eichhorn and Gesenius. He had a very positive attitude to German biblical research and to Germany in general, which is why he remained professor after the annexation of Alsace by Germany. For his life and work see Vincent, *Leben*, and E. JACOB, “Edouard Reuss, un théologien indépendant”, *RHPbR* 71 (1991) 427–435.

¹⁹³ On his rather tragic life see Conrad, *Graf* (2011), 15–72.

getical mainstream.¹⁹⁴ It is quite possible that Graf heard of this idea when he attended classes with Reuss in Strasbourg. Reuss observed that the Laws in the middle books of the Pentateuch were unknown to the Prophets. Those laws do not fit into the time of the monarchy, but rather into the context of the Babylonian exile or later. Reuss also predicted that the view that Leviticus was later than Deuteronomy would soon become a widely accepted idea in Pentateuchal research.¹⁹⁵ Indeed, Graf always recognized that it was his teacher Reuss from whom he adopted the view that the priestly legislation of the Pentateuch belonged to the youngest texts of the Pentateuch.¹⁹⁶ Before turning to Graf, however, we should emphasize that the idea of a late (exilic or postexilic) date of the priestly laws of the Pentateuch had been "in the air" since the 1830s.

Wilhelm Vatke claimed in 1835 that Ezekiel ignored major parts of the legislation of the books of Exodus and Leviticus, which were probably only composed in the exilic period.¹⁹⁷ George defended the same idea, arguing that the ritual laws in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers were written in Babylonian times, later than the Deuteronomic laws.¹⁹⁸ At the same time, Peter von Bohlen also observed that there was no evidence that the priestly laws of the Pentateuch had been observed before the time of the exile.¹⁹⁹

A major contribution was made by the work of the Jewish scholar Julius Popper (1822–1884) who, in 1862, published a monograph on *The Biblical Account of the Tabernacle* in which he compared the building instructions (Exod 25–31) with the account of the building work (Exod 35–40). The linguistic and logical differences between the two accounts led Popper to postulate that several chapters of the second description stemmed from a later redaction that was carried out in the third century BCE.²⁰⁰ Popper did not determine whether all priestly laws of the so-called *Grundschrift* belonged to the postexilic period,²⁰¹ but in attributing parts of the account of the Tabernacle to the postexilic period, Popper

¹⁹⁴ Vincent, Reuss (1990), 256–262.

¹⁹⁵ Reuss published this idea only in 1850 in an encyclopaedia article: E. REUSS, "Judenthum", *Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften und der Kunst* (ed. J. C. Ersch / J. G. Gruber; Leipzig 1850), 327–347, 329–337. He narrates the story of his initial intuition in 1833 in the foreword to his *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments* (Braunschweig 1881), vii–viii. In *La Bible. L'Histoire Sainte et la Loi (Pentateuque et Josué)*, vol. 1 (Paris 1879), he speaks of a "savant d'origine alsacienne [Graf], qui mit à profit ... les principes qu'il avait entendu recommander trente ans auparavant quand il était encore sur les bancs d'école" (32), without mentioning his own name explicitly.

¹⁹⁶ Letter to Reuss, published in Budde, Briefwechsel (1904), 501. See also Külling, *Datierung* (1964), 6–7.

¹⁹⁷ Vatke, *Theologie*, 534–539. He argues for instance that Ezekiel could not have written the last chapters of his book if Leviticus and Numbers had already existed. Later Vatke gave up this opinion and returned to the traditional view on the age of the "Elohistic source", see Külling, *ibid.*, 38–39.

¹⁹⁸ Feste (1835), 11–13. See above.

¹⁹⁹ P. VON BOHLEN, *Die Genesis historisch-kritisch erläutert* (Königsberg 1835; ET: *Introduction to the Book of Genesis*, London 1855). He recognized that the laws in Leviticus had been successively compiled by priests (clxxii) in the postexilic period, and showed that the narrative of Gen 38 is unaware of Levitical legislation according to which Judah would have been punished with death (364–365). Von Bohlen dedicated his work to de Wette, who reacted in admitting that von Bohlen had presented valuable arguments for dating the Levitical system to a later age; see Thompson, *Law* (1970), 24.

²⁰⁰ *Stiftshütte* (1862), 7.

²⁰¹ On p. 208, he wonders whether these laws are earlier than Ezekiel or later.

supported Graf's ideas that he published some years later.²⁰² According to HaCohen, "Popper's work contains the ('Jewish?') roots of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis".²⁰³

Graf's critical work on the Hebrew Bible started in 1855 with an investigation on the sanctuary of Shilo in the book of Judges, in which he tried to show that the books of Judges and Samuel do not presuppose the idea of one central sanctuary.²⁰⁴ Consequently, the Tabernacle of Exod 25–40 is a literary fiction that transposes Solomon's temple into the wilderness. This fiction, together with other similar texts in Exodus – Numbers, stemmed from the time of the exile.²⁰⁵ Graf's major contribution to Pentateuchal research was his 1865 work on the historical books of the Hebrew Bible.²⁰⁶ Graf started with the affirmation that the Book of Deuteronomic law (Deut 5–26 and 28) corresponded to the book of the Josianic reform. He then asked which texts of the Pentateuch were to be regarded as earlier or later than the first edition of Deuteronomy. In a second step, Graf demonstrated that the priestly laws in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers²⁰⁷ were added in several stages: some in the exilic period before Ezra, the majority by Ezra himself and some collections even later.²⁰⁸ Like his teacher Reuss, Graf defended a supplementary hypothesis in postulating that the *Grundschrift* of the Pentateuch, which also contained texts like Genesis 17, had been revised by the Jehovist in the eighth century.²⁰⁹ This Jehovist comprised a Hexateuch of a sort, reaching from the creation of the world to the conquest of the land. A later redactor, the Deuteronomist, inserted in exilic times the book of Deuteronomy by adding Deut 1–4 and 29–34 and by thoroughly reworking the book of Joshua. The same Deuteronomist also reworked the books of Kings.²¹⁰ The priestly laws existed in the time of Ezra as an independent collection which a redactor later inserted into the Deuteronomistic edition of the Hexateuch.²¹¹ Bishop Colenso expressed a similar view in a letter of 1869: "I have no doubt that large parts of the three middle books & Joshua are due to the later or Levitical legislator after the captivity".²¹²

Graf's reconstruction of the formation of the Hexateuch received much atten-

²⁰² Graf was aware of Popper's work, see Thompson, *ibid.* 34, and Conrad, Graf (2011), 117.

²⁰³ HaCohen, *Reclaiming*, 138. He quotes a review that was published some year later in a Protestant Journal in which we read: "Mr. Popper can clearly claim to be the first to point definitively to this idea, which is of enormous importance to Pentateuch criticism as a whole".

²⁰⁴ F. GRAF, *De templo Silonensi commentatio ad illustrandum locum Iud. XVIII, 30 sq.* (Meissen 1855). For a summary of the work see Conrad, Graf, 80–87.

²⁰⁵ *De templo* (1855), 20–23.

²⁰⁶ Despite the publication date (1866), the book appeared in 1865, see Houtman, *Pentateuch*, 100.

²⁰⁷ The idea that Numbers contains mostly later supplements to the original legislation can already be found in A. KNOBEL, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua* (KEHAT 1; Leipzig 1861).

²⁰⁸ *Bücher* (1866), 85–117; see Conrad, Graf, 99–121.

²⁰⁹ Graf was aware of the similarities between Gen 17 and the priestly laws, but explained them by pointing to an archaic priestly language used in those centuries (92–93).

²¹⁰ *Bücher*, 6–18, 109–110. Graf does not accept the idea of a Deuteronomistic edition of the books of Judges and Samuel. He ascribes the so-called *dtr* texts in these books to the Jehovist, see Conrad, Graf, 126–128.

²¹¹ *Bücher*, 74–75.

²¹² Letter dated 9th of January 1869, published in Draper, *Eye of the Storm* (2003), 96.

tion and positive as well as negative criticism.²¹³ Particularly important were comments by T. Nöldeke and A. Kuenen who criticized Graf's decision to split the *Grundschrift* into an older narrative and younger priestly laws.²¹⁴ Nöldeke (1836–1930, professor of Semitics²¹⁵ in Kiel, and after the German annexation of Alsace, in Strasbourg) argued that several narratives of the *Grundschrift* were closely related to the laws and that the *Grundschrift* as a whole should be considered to be preexilic. He admitted, however, that it was impossible to prove that this document was the oldest source of the Pentateuch.²¹⁶ In a letter to Graf, the Dutch scholar A. Kuenen discussed whether it was preferable to locate the whole *Grundschrift* after the Jehovist in a later period. Graf answered in French on the 12th of November 1866, recognizing that this was a new and surprising solution to the problem and saying that he was going to try to come to a new "conviction raisonnée".²¹⁷ In an article published after his death, he proposed a revised view on the formation of the Pentateuch,²¹⁸ acknowledging that the Jehovist was not a redactor but an independent document. Thus, it was no longer necessary to date the *Grundschrift* at the beginning of the Pentateuch. Quite the contrary, it now formed the last step in the formation of the first books of the Bible. Graf did, however, remain an advocate of the supplementary hypothesis. He claimed that the *Grundschrift* should be understood as a redaction and a revision of the older Jehovistic source.²¹⁹ It is interesting to note that one of the most important forerunners of Wellhausen did not advocate a documentary hypothesis but a supplementary theory, which is again discussed in present scholarship as a viable option for an adequate understanding of the so-called priestly texts of the Pentateuch.²²⁰

A similar position with regard to the "Elohistic document" was adopted in 1874 by August Kayser, also a student of Reuss, who argued that "the so-called *Grundschrift* was composed in its entirety (historical and legislative portions alike) after the return from captivity".²²¹ One of the most influential scholars who, together with Wellhausen, proposed the idea of an exilic or postexilic date of the priestly texts of the Pentateuch (in the context of the "newer" documentary hypothesis [JE, D, P] almost for a century the main hypothesis on the formation of the Pentateuch) was the Dutch scholar Abraham Kuenen. His approach will be presented in the chapter dedicated to him and Wellhausen.

²¹³ Conrad, Graf, 132–141.

²¹⁴ One should also mention the review by E. RIEHM in *ThStKr* 41 (1868), 350–379, who, similarly to Nöldeke, defended the unity of the *Grundschrift* and advocated a documentary hypothesis.

²¹⁵ His work on the Quran received a prize from the French *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*. On his life see M. FRENCHOWSKI, "Theodor Nöldeke", *BBKL* 6 (1993), cols 979–983.

²¹⁶ *Untersuchungen* (1869), 141: *auf keinen Fall darf man die Forderung aufstellen, dass die Grundschrift von allen ausführlichen Quellen des Pentateuchs gerade die älteste sein sollte.*

²¹⁷ Conrad, Graf, 135–136.

²¹⁸ *Grundschrift*.

²¹⁹ Referring to Nöldeke, he argues that it is impossible to reconstruct a coherent narrative, *Grundschrift*, 471–472.

²²⁰ For an overview see S. SHECTMAN / J.S. BADEN (eds.), *The Strata of the Priestly Writings. Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (AThANT 95; Zürich 2009).

²²¹ *Urgeschichte* (1874). English quotation according to Rogerson, *OT Criticism* (1984), 259.