

The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, edited by Harold R. Willoughby (The University of Chicago Press) 1947

"Contemporary Trends in Jewish Bible Study" by Felix A. Levy

p. 101 David Z. Hoffman (1843-1921), a magnificent scholar, supplied what Wiener lacked in preparation for the assault on his opponents. There is astute and encyclopedic learning, sound logic, and critical acumen in much of his Die Wichtigsten Instanzen gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese (1904), Leviticus (1905-6), and Deuteronomium (1913). He argues against a separate Holiness Code in Leviticus, inserted by P, and asserts, as do other Jewish scholars after him, that Ezekiel shows dependance on the Pentateuch and not vice versa. Hoffman was followed by a host of others who maintain the traditional stand that the Hexateuch in its present order is chronologically correct and natural and that there is more or less a unity of narrative and content, that does not permit of the usual carving up into fragments, so colorfully blocked by the Polychrome Bible. It is strange that Christian scholars have almost unanimously neglected this meritorious work and that none has deigned to answer the author.

Isaac Halevy in his Hebrew history of Jewish literature, begun about 1900 and called Dorot Ha-Rishonim, continues what Hoffmann began. The most recent volume of his work, the sixth (1939), takes the literary-critical theory apart and shows its weakness and futility. Approaching the problem from another angle, Chaim Tchernowitz in his Hebrew History of the Halakhah (not yet completed), by tracing the growth of the law from within, shows the documentary hypothesis, with its ideas of a "straight-line evolution" that assumes differing literary sources, to be wrong.

p. 102 Kaufman rejects completely the J-E-D-P-R division, not because the Bible may not be composite but because the original documents can no longer be determined. The quest for these is useless