

Old Testament writings. But the Greek manuscript tradition is equally fatal to his claim. Two of the three great uncial manuscripts which preserve the major portion of the Greek Bible in its Christian form, *Codex Sinaiticus* of the fourth century A.D. and *Codex Alexandrinus* of the fifth century, do not place the prophetic writings at the end of the Old Testament, as Mr. Kaufmann alleges was done deliberately "when it [Christianity] put together its canon." Moreover, the Christians did not make their own Greek version of the Old Testament; they took over the existing Greek version of the Alexandrian Jews. There is no evidence that they deliberately changed the order of the books in this version, and what evidence exists points the other way.

The first century Jewish historian Flavius Josephus

describes the Jewish Bible as he knew it; in his list the historical and prophetic books (including *Chronicles*) precede the books "containing hymns to God and precepts" (*Contra Apion*, I, 8). The reference must be to the Jewish Greek version before Christians could have tampered with it. After all, what Christian machinations can be detected in the attachment of Ruth to Judges and of Lamentations to Jeremiah? In the placing of Esther with the historical books? Or, for that matter, in the displacement of *Chronicles*? The explanation given by the author that the last was done out of antipathy to its conclusion is as childish as it is baseless.

Mr. Kaufmann might profitably meditate on the biblical proverb, "He who digs a pit [for others] will fall into it himself" (*Proverbs 26:27*).

II. The Parry

WALTER KAUFMANN

MR. SCOTT gives the impression that the central claims, whatever they may be, of such a writer as myself need not be taken seriously. Instead of discussing these claims Mr. Scott argues (1) *ad hominem* and (2) that in *The Faith of a Heretic* I have erred on many specific points. Most of those points are admittedly irrelevant to the major arguments in my book.

The *ad hominem* attack I shall document without attempting any detailed defense: "Probably it is too much to expect philosophic detachment of a person of Mr. Kaufmann's background." "[But this does] not acquit him of . . . failure to recognize the effect upon his thinking of a heritage of resentment." "Such anti-Semitism-in-reverse is just as reprehensible and unlovely as the original article." Some of this I fail to understand. I am accused of something as reprehensible as anti-Semitism, but I don't know of what. Anti-Semitism does not mean the belief that some of the teachings of the Jewish religion are untenable; it means rather agitation to discriminate against individuals because they are Jews. What is "anti-Semitism-in-reverse"? Surely I have never proposed discrimination against anybody!

Unsupported accusations like this are to be found throughout Mr. Scott's essay. Another example: "It is not the Old Testament but the Talmud which is the Jewish counterpart of the Christians' New Testament. Mr. Kaufmann deliberately obscures this fact . . ." This sounds like a charge of mendaciousness.

Coming now to my alleged errors, I certainly consider Mr. Scott's claim about the Talmud false, and I believe that most Jews as well as the majority of detached Christian scholars would agree with me. Traditional Christianity considers the New Testament to be God's revelation in a way in which traditional Judaism does not consider the Talmud to be God's revelation; indeed, Liberal and Reform Judaism make little of the Talmud—often nothing at all.

I am charged with "forgetting that the Old Testament was at first the *only* Bible of Christians and has always been an essential part of the Christian Bible." Actually I make quite a point of this in my book, e.g., on page 240 and in section 70.

In the case of the pharaoh, Mr. Scott says that I have "failed to notice" something that—according to *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, edited by James B. Pritchard (second revised edition, 1955, page 378, note 18)—I was amply justified in not noticing because it is probably false.

Many of Mr. Scott's points depend on interpretations of my text which are strange indeed—especially when found in an article denouncing misrepresentation. When I remark that it is "unfortunate that Paul referred to the Torah . . . as 'the Law,'" Mr. Scott imputes to me ignorance of the fact that Paul did not originate this usage.

Mr. Scott accuses me of "disposing of unwelcome data" and suggests—quite falsely—that this is what I have done with the parable of the Good Samaritan. Any reader who looks up my pages 220 ff., instead of taking my critic's word, will find how wrong he is. He points out that "Chronicles overlooks David's adultery," and adds: "On Mr. Kaufmann's critical principles presumably David has been slandered." According to my critical principles—and those of most scholars—it is much more probable that *Chronicles* omits what seems offensive to the pious author. That this is my approach to *Chronicles* is explicitly stated on page 158. Unless we use one approach for the Old Testament and another for the New, we might well ask, as I did in passing, why three of the four evangelists omitted the parable of the Good Samaritan.

Following his charge that I have offered unsupported data, Mr. Scott opens the next paragraph with a sentence that is clearly false: "The author has little or nothing to say about the basic and far-reaching

agreement between the Gospels." The paragraph's second sentence contains one of many unsupported charges. Its third sentence, which professes to give "an example," gives no example whatever of what has just been said but refers to "the tirade (pages 220-24) against the Sermon on the Mount's idea of reward for ethical obedience." In the first place, the Sermon on the Mount is mentioned only on page 223 of my book. On pages 220 f. I discuss John and Luke; page 222 contains passages that demonstrate some basic agreements among the three Synoptics. On page 223, finally, I say that the Sermon on the Mount, too, agrees with what I have found. That blessing and curse are also found in Moses and the prophets I emphatically state on the same page before I add that "the future they envisaged was a social future."

I tried to show in some detail that "the relation of the Gospels to the prophets has often been presented in a false light by those lacking either Troeltsch's scrupulous scholarship or his forthright honesty." Some liberals with a keen social conscience may feel that if Troeltsch and I were right about the ethic of the Gospels, the ethic of some of the prophets would be more congenial; but that does not make my interpretation a "tirade." Least of all can this important question be settled by pronouncing the words "it is simply not so" and by accusing me of willful perversion, as Mr. Scott does.

Merely by Adding 'Merely'

I should be happy if readers would reread the chapters in the prophets that Mr. Scott cites, though I doubt that many will find those chapters relevant to any point at issue. Mr. Scott takes a phrase out of context and manufactures a fault by adding a crucial word: "The prophets were not merely 'solitary individuals who criticized . . .'" It is easy to convert true statements into false ones by adding "merely." Mr. Scott is a minister, but of course he is not *merely* a minister.

Mr. Scott's discussion of polygamy strikes me as an example of homiletic rather than scholarly interpretation, and it leaves my point intact. It would be an understatement to say that, using Scripture, it would be as easy to justify polygamy as to prove it wrong.

On page 200 I write: "In Israel, no man was ever worshiped or accorded even semi-divine status." Mr. Scott asks whether I have never read the second Psalm or the ninth chapter of Isaiah. I have, but I don't find any statement in either that confutes me. If only my critic had named names!

That my interpretation of Genesis 1 "turns on" the resemblance of the two words for sun and servant is a false conclusion. Omitting that remark leaves my interpretation and argument completely unimpaired. I point out some differences between Ikhnaton's monotheism ("of the many traditional gods he recognizes only one, Aton, the sun") and the Pentateuch, in which "any worship of the sun is scorned. . . . And in the creation story in Genesis the sun is created together with the moon to serve man as an instrument

that makes possible the calculation of days, months, and years" (see verses 14 f.). Still, Mr. Scott is right in saying that the word for servant that is written like the word for sun does not occur in the Bible—a fact which I should have mentioned; he is also right in noting that I should not have spoken—once!—of "Paul of Tarshish." No argument depended on that epithet.

No Real Issue Joined

The two points Mr. Scott discusses at length, at the end of his essay, join no genuine issue. I reject the extremes of *Quellenscheidung*, using that name, and explain why I am not persuaded that verses and half-verses in the Pentateuch can be assigned to separate putative authors. I mentioned Budde as one representative of this approach because he employed it graphically, and Driver as another because his book is easily available in paperback form. It is not in the least inconsistent, as Mr. Scott alleges, for me to go on to grant that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses, and that Isaiah 40 ff. was written during the exile. It still seems to me that Nyberg's position agrees with mine at the point on which I claimed agreement. I do not think it shows any ignorance on my part to associate *Quellenscheidung* with the higher criticism and to suggest that it leans heavily on what Mr. Scott calls "excesses of arbitrary text emendation."

Regarding the order of the biblical books, Mr. Scott ignores my point. Oddly, he speaks of "the last words of II Chronicles, which say that the Lord had commanded Cyrus to build him a house at Jerusalem." But these are not at all the last words, which are rather: "Whoever is among you of all his people, may the Lord his God be with him, and let him go up." This is the end of the Hebrew Bible. Nothing that Mr. Scott says suggests that the Hebrew Bible ever ended, as the Christian Old Testament does, with Malachi, whose final words are: ". . . I come and smite the land with a curse." The Christians thought that this was what had happened after A.D. 70 and 135. This whole matter is utterly peripheral as far as my argument in *The Faith of a Heretic* is concerned, but it is generally agreed that the Pentateuch was canonized first, the prophets next, and the Hagiographa last. That the order of the Hagiographa varied in the very early days is true, but the question why the Christians put the prophetic books at the end remains.

No doubt my books are imperfect and could be improved in many ways; no detached reader of *The Faith of a Heretic* is likely to gain the impression that I do not realize this fact. But Mr. Scott's charges are not presented in a manner conducive to the advance of either knowledge or understanding. He even gives the impression that I find nothing good in the New Testament, which is far from true. To give a single example: far better than the verse in Proverbs on which Mr. Scott wishes me to meditate have I loved the following verse in the Sermon on the Mount—one of many cited with admiration in my books: "Why do you see the speck that is in your brother's eye, but do not notice the log that is in your own eye?"