

PENTATEUCHAL AUTHORSHIP: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF EXISTING IMAGINATIONS

Abstract. The Pentateuch is a collection of the five unique books that form the first part of the Old Testament. It is the collection of the books with a strong argument against the Traditional views of Pentateuchal authorship by various source and Historical critics especially from eighteenth to mid-twentieth centuries. These arguments started with Professor Jean Astruc who was a French Medical Doctor down to his successor, Wellhausen, who was a source critic of the Pentateuch. He popularized the Jahist, Elohist, Deuteronomist and priestly (JEDP) Hypothesis of the Pentateuch. Also, another anti-mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy 34 that talks about his death because there is an imagination that the dead man has no breath to write about the events that took place after him. Therefore, Moses must not have penned down Deuteronomy. It is against this backdrop that this article, holding to both internal and external shreds of evidence memory, seeks to establish that the reliable imaginations of the authorship of the Pentateuch are mosaic authorship and not Wellhausen Documentary Hypothesis.

Key words: *JEDP, Moses, Authorship, Hypothesis, Imaginations and Deuteronomy 34.*

1. Introduction

As a child, I was taught by my Sunday school teacher's imagination about the Pentateuch that the first five books of the Old Testament were written by Moses. But as a grown-up person, there was a day I was reading Genesis where I discovered that no Moses was mentioned and in Deuteronomy 34, I also read about the death of Moses. I started doubting the Mosaic authorship of the other parts of the Pentateuch, especially chapter 34 which talks about his death and events that took place after his death before my lecturer in ECWA Theological Seminary, Igbaja, introduced me to the problematic discussions of the documentary hypothesis. There are volumes of books and articles in this mosaic equivocal authorship but no one has approached this issue as the writer did from the (imagination) perspectives. For decades, the issue of the imaginative authorship of the Pentateuch has been problematic to both Christian scholars and non-Christian scholars, both liberal theologians and evangelical theologians, and even philosophers who are fascinated in biblical studies, especially the Pentateuch. The issues of authorship are contentious imaginations in most, if not

all, of the books of the Bible. For centuries, the authorship of the Pentateuch has been the key concern than any other books in the Bible. There are two main imaginations which have contended for hegemony over the decades about the authorship of the Pentateuch. These two imaginations are the Mosaic Authorship and the JEDP Documentary Hypothesis. The Mosaic Authorship is the views held by the majority of Jews and Christians, while the JEDP documentary hypothesis is an imagination held mostly by the liberal and conservative scholars who have enjoyed a great deal of popularity following the Enlightenment period. The documentary hypothesis seems to be the imagination held by the so-called critical scholars.

Mosaic authorship is a tradition ascribed to Moses. That is, the authorship of the five books of the Torah or Pentateuch - Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus and Deuteronomy are said, by tradition, to have been written by Moses. Douglas asserted that the question of the authorship of the Pentateuch, especially the book of Genesis, is the debatable issue for centuries, especially by source-critical scholars. It is those same debatable imaginations that spanned through centuries that gathered us here today in this graduate seminar so we can listen to another perspective of the imagination. The arguments are that all these uses of names JED&P must come from different sources by varieties of authors apart from Moses.

The tradition of Mosaic authorship is disconcerting to scholars because the hypothesis does not make sense to them at all. Many scholars who are supporting the mosaic authorship claim the view must be handled as the mere hypothesis because there is no concrete evidence of the documents found somewhere in the ancient manuscripts. Another problematic argument is Deuteronomy 34. Those scholars who are against the Documentary Hypothesis find it problematic to agree with them that Moses wrote Deuteronomy 34. This is all about the death of Moses and the events that took place after his death. The question is who is the author of Deuteronomy 34, the dead man – Moses or the living Joshua who was his successor? So, please humbly wait and listen to the scholarly imaginations for you to develop your own hypothesis on the imaginations of Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

2. JEPD Documentaries Hypothesis

Evolutional Arguments of JEDP Documentary Hypothesis

The critical study of the Pentateuch started in Eighteen century, with source critical approach to the study of the Pentateuch. The distinguishing of the Pentateuchal sources stated with Jean Astruc in (1753), he imagined that Moses might have to do plagiarism by using other sources for the compilation of the Pentateuch, and to distinguish the sources Moses used, he had to introduce the divine names Elohim and Jehovah in the book of Genesis. Jean Astruc was neither a theologian nor an archaeologist of the Scripture, but a French medical doctor who lived within the period of 1684 to 1766. After 28 years of his argument, Johann G. Eichhorn accepted Astruc's imagination on the Pentateuch in (1781-83); he is sometimes called the father of OT criticism. Eichhorn, the first higher critic of the Pentateuch, a German scholar, concurs with Astruc's J and E different sources in Genesis. Eichhorn, in the hypothesis of Astruc's source criticism, imagined that different names mean different source but he also admitted that there must be other different sources, apart from the J and E which he came up with the imaginations of style and contents as means to have clear comprehension of the original sources better in all the Pentateuch and after his imagination prevailed to him, he dismissed the traditional view of Mosaic authorship. European Scholars in eighteen century devoted to answering these two questions; how does one explain the unity with such a diverse document discovered by Astruc and Eichhorn? What are the basic characterization features of each document? At this period alone there are about seventy different sources isolated in Genesis and K.D Iigen postulates that Elohist should be divided into two E1 and E2 and grouped the other numerous sources to three J, E1 and E2.

After the period of the eighteenth century, in the Nineteenth century, there was lots of interest in the documentary hypothesis of Genesis. Scholars started fragmentary consideration instead of the documentary. Wilhelm M.L. de Wette was among the early proponents of the fragmentary hypothesis that they were fragments edited within the exilic period. He sees nothing like the history of Israel religion at the pre-exilic period. He imagines that the portion of Deuteronomy is Josiah's founding document in the Pentateuch. Heinrich Ewald in 1823, attacks the concept of the fragmentary hypothesis by de Wette. Ewald proposed the supplementary hypothesis that J supplemented/enhanced E to strands from the Book of Deuteronomy and he later proposed crystallization hypothesis that welcomes many authors plus Joshua as the

authors of the Pentateuch, he prefers Hexateuch (six books) than the Pentateuch (Five Books).

Hermann W. Hupfeld and Eduard Riehm pointed out the documents to be self-contained documents behind the Pentateuch and E1 as a foundational source for E2 and J. Hupfeld claimed there are two distinct Elohist; one Elohim from Gen. 1-19 and the second Elohim from Gen. 20-50. At the same time, Riehm discovers Deuteronomy as an independent document. Then, there the sequence for documentary sources change to E1, E2, J and D. Karl H. Graf and Abraham Kuenen agreed with Hupfeld's sequence but convinced with the imagination that the law came late at the history of Israel. Graf imagined that the E1 must be exilic at 622 BC which was combined by the editor who probably was Ezra as a priest to E2, J and D and formed the Pentateuch. Therefore, his sequence will be E2, J, D, E1. While his partner Kuenen reversed the sequence with the assumptions that J must have to be the earliest to J, E2, D and E. However, these two scholars moved from the direction of source criticism to historical criticism. Abraham Kuenen argued that the Hexateuch (Genesis through Joshua) was the work of post-exilic origin, which he based on the allusions to that period in the legal and narrative material in the corpus.

At the end of Graf's and Kuenen's scholarship, half of the characterization future questions raised in the eighteenth century seem to be answered near the end of the nineteenth century. But the problem of the unity composition of the documents remained which led to Julius Wellhausen's period in 1878. Wellhausen was able to combine the Hypothesis of Graf and Kuenen with the historical-critical approach and that appeared to answer the question of unity. To Wellhausen, the documents of J & E might have woven together by somebody or group of people in a particular place because the documents have different periods, concern and motives of writing. Therefore, to the Wellhausen, these documents did not tell us the time they were compelled to the book of Genesis and others but only tell us the traditional history of Israel. Wellhausen stated that documents pointed out to us about the religion of Israel from 10c Foreword.

Wellhausen was the one who popularized the Documentary Hypothesis in his scholarly writings. That is why the theory is known as Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. Wellhausen imagined Deuteronomy had been composed in the seventh century during post-exilic period taking JE and D as the same period which the last major redaction combined the priestly P material with JE and D. He assumed that the laws of Israelite were very late and the various redactions resulted to P. His assumptions were that the Pentateuchal law appeared at the beginning of the Jewish postexilic period rather than during the Israelite

history. To Wellhausen, JE is a product of divided monarchy which should be a Judaic document in 10c. others source critics insisted that J&E sources were combined somewhere by someone in the 8c and 9c because they cover the history of mankind, patriarchs and matriarchs, Moses and Exodus from Egypt.

The other problematic source is the Deuteronomist source “D” materials. They appeared primarily in the book of Deuteronomy and only occasionally in other parts of the Pentateuch. These materials are usually dated sometimes between Josiah’s reform in approximately 622 B.C. “D” represented the work of the Levites who defected from northern Israel to Judah. However, there are no concrete facts about which law was really found in the temple. McKeown imagined this priestly document of rituals, laws and Holiness to be influenced by 8th-century prophets. However, the most emphatic imagination was that even if this was influenced, it was during King Josiah’s law who was imagined by source critics that he wrote Deuteronomy to justify his actions of destroying Idols. The D documentary hypothesis can also be called 2 Kings 22-23 hypothesis because the passage is the root of source critic’s imaginations of Josiah’s discovery of the law in the temple. According to the source critics, D source insisted on only one temple is accepted to Yahweh others must be destroyed. This was the key concern to the religious reform of King Josiah. Source critics concluded that D source was composed of the Northern because its concern is more on the Northern Kingdom of Israel.

The last one is the priestly source “P” which holds that it was a group of priests who composed Leviticus and compiled and edited other portions of the Pentateuch between 500 and 400 B.C. According to this reconstruction, “P” designed the Pentateuch to direct social order and worship after a remnant of Israel had returned from exile. The priestly major concern is the religious institutions, sacrificial system, ethical holiness and ritual holiness, so because of that must be a priestly document. Wellhausen assumed P source to 586 after many Jews have been taken into exile in Babylon and a very late source to Wellhausen because of the rituals and other things as the development of religion today. Despite source critics before him sees it as the earliest source. The Source critics scholars made-up priestly writer to be the final editor of the Old Testament.

After Wellhausen period came to an end. Hermann Gunkel came in the Early and Mid-twenty century. He accepted the Wellhausen’s imaginations but also have the fundamental criticism of Wellhausen's theory. He proposed the oral sagas collection and preservation for centuries instead of relatively writing by various individual authors. Archer like

Gunkel's assumption indorses Moses as a compiler of the documents that made up the Pentateuch when he utters that while materials which the author used for the composition of this book no doubt came to him from five to six centuries before his time, prior to Jacob's migration into Egypt, nevertheless Moses seems to have served as a Spirit-guided compiler and interpreter of the pre-existent material which had come to him from his forebears in oral and written forms.

However, Gunkel focuses on a form-critical approach that later developed by Albrecht Alt and Martin North. For North, an important common base text (G for Grundlage) of many Pentateuch sources came into existence in the pre-monarchic period and established decisive stages on the formation of the Pentateuch. Von Rad looked at the entire Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, he whispered that Israel preserved her history as a short historical creed edited by J who filled it out with materials that he adopted from the local and tribal sources. That led to Thomas L. Thompson and John Van Seters who argued back the supplementary hypothesis. He envisages P material as a postexilic document, supplement of J from the book of Genesis in 300 BC and questions the existence of the E source. Rudolf came up and rejected the classical source of JEDP and it tends to atomize the text. He denied the existence of J and E self-contained and suggested D and P as a redaction of the whole. But priestly and deuteronomistic history incorporated the patriarchal/matriarchal history with the rest of the Pentateuchal history with the rest of the Pentateuch after a priestly author undertook another division. After this source-critical analysis, concerted moves to the final form of the text.

Julius A. Bewer and Robert H. Pfeiffer were the supporters of the additional Documentary Hypothesis theory, they approximated that there are J1, J2, E1, E2, E3, G, K, and L but with the paucity of manuscript support. Fuller asserted that "According to this Documentary Hypothesis theory, the Pentateuch was formed by the nation of Israel after the fact to justify, shape or explain their customs and religion." The argument was that at the moment Judah was yet to develop her monarchical cult and she was under the control of Persian king who also supported them to rebuild the temple. Rainer Albertz claims that there was an important redaction of Genesis beginning in the exilic period when a patriarchal history was produced. He proposes that there were two phases of composition (PH1 and PH2) with the later phase being postexilic, during which time Genesis 20-22 was composed. Albertz bases this on the Diaspora of the early postexilic period (539-520 BCE), the literary period when Abraham is portrayed as an alien sojourning in Southern Palestine Bruce Vawter, asserting that while there is no longer a comfortable scholarly consensus on the source-critical approach to the composition of

Genesis, scholars remain convinced of its basic reliability regardless of its shortcomings and objections.

After such a range of imaginations, scholars like Coggins and Westerman see Pentateuch as a work of exilic writers because the Abrahamic cycle may have passed through revisions of the narratives with such a theological interest behind it by the writer of the Pentateuch must have been from the late exilic period. The post-exilic seems to be unreasonable to Coggins and Westermann because of the higher theological consideration of the books. Despite the fact that there are other scholars who actually dismissed Pentateuch to six-century BCE like R. N. Whybray and his supportive scholars such as N. E. Wagner, R. Rendtorff, H. H. Schmid and A. D. H. Mayes, nothing like Pentateuch till in six century, close to the Josiah discovering of the law in the temple. These scholars imagining that the entire Pentateuch, not only the book of Deuteronomy since the entire Pentateuch is the law, was not written till the discovering of Josiah's law in the temple. The Writer does not know how reliable this information is but if that was reliable than Josiah's law should not only be Deuteronomy but rather the bunch of Pentateuch entirely or the totality of the Law of Moses. There are some of the literary structuralism scholars that were actually developed some years that the Pentateuch is the work of fragmentary and supplementary hypothesis, researcher must confess, that he does not agree with this so-called fragmentary hypothesis and supplementary hypothesis because it is fully an assumption of a single scholar without serious scholarly consensus and extra-biblical evidence notwithstanding anyone is allowed to develop his own hypothesis.

3. Imaginative Arguments against Documentary Hypothesis

As the anti-mosaic scholars assumed that different names mean different authors so also others imagined that, different names do not mean different authors. The first scholar at this point of imagination is, Norman L. Geisler who imagined it in this perspective: "The majestic Elohim is an appropriate word when speaking of creation, as in Genesis 1. Yahweh the Covenant-maker is more appropriate when God engages people, as in Genesis 2-3." However, is there no possibility that Moses could not have known the two names of God? Must different names of God mean different authors? Awokoya claimed that Astruc has the paucity of understanding of the nature of ancient near eastern literature, and he wrongly assumed that he had the tools to discern the various sources of an ancient document.

Thomas Egger asserted his thoughts in this perspective with an illustration that, Yahweh is a name like my first name is Tom. God's first name, his given personal name, is Yahweh. The name Elohim is technically not a name but a title. It means "God." It refers to his divinity, and also the name El, so that, in usage in the Old Testament, there would be times when it would be appropriate to use one rather than another. Moses was a grown-up Egyptian, and the Pentateuch has so many Egyptian references: "A large number of idioms and terms of speech, which are characteristically Egyptian in origin, even though translated into Hebrew." Moses was not an illiterate man in Egypt historically and no Israel religion traditional historian will be repudiated that, however, that alone disapproves some of the arguments of the Documentary Hypothesis.

The other problematic thoughts of this theory are that it was condemning the spiritual and intelligent man Moses who was also a Jewish man for being incapable of using different styles of writing and using different names for their covenant God that might have been revealed to him. Fuller thoughts, that the use of the name is theologically determined; it does not mean different sources. Astruc never knew about the ingenuities of the users of different names by Israel to their covenant God because he was a medical doctor who knew not that much pertaining to the Scripture, but jumped into the Scripture with his medical worldview and fancies as a professor of medicine and only read scripture for personal devotion. He should have known that Hebrew authors differ from other writers known in the history of literature in that they alone were capable of using more than one name for God," or for that matter, more than one style of writing. Hasel asserted that source critics, however, are inconsistent when it comes to this criterion because J also uses the name Elohim and E also uses the name, Yahweh. This inconsistency is said to be the work of reactors, but it does, nonetheless, throw doubt upon the objectivity of the procedure of using names as the basis for distinguishing sources. He furthers that all literature from the second millennium B.C. so far, no reputable scholar has attempted to delineate literary sources, redactors, or an oral pre-history from these Near Eastern documents on the basis of different names for the deity.

The Documentary Hypothesis makes sense as far as it remains a hypothesis because no biblical archaeology is claiming to have discovered E.J.D and P documentary hypothesis' documents. In the future, the document might be discovered, but for now, it only makes sense as the hypothesis. Wellhausen's Documentary Hypothesis was at its zenith during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the debate revolved around the dating of sources, when they were combined, and the number of writers or schools of writers. JEDP theory ultimately grew in complexity having more sources (i.e. J1, J2, etc.)

and more editors (redactor 5, 6, etc). Adherents to JEDP theory believed that the Pentateuch reached its final form during the time of Kings (1050-586 BC) or as late as the Post-Exilic Period (538-432 BC). Today, as the result of the equivocal dilemma and criticisms brought on by anthropological and archaeological ingenious findings which may be right or wrong and literary analysis, many have declined from JEDP hypothesis only a few are still interested on the documentary hypothesis. However, some anti-Mosaic imaginative critics of the Pentateuch will still be dating Pentateuch to this late 500 BC of King Josiah.

Kenneth Kitchen points out that we do not have external evidence that texts were combined as claimed in the Documentary Hypothesis in the literature of the Ancient Near East. Whybray is among the scholars who rejected the Documentary Hypothesis, arguing that the Pentateuch is the work of an ancient historian, who wrote from a mass of material mostly of recent origin to him, which he radically reworked with substantial amounts of his own inventive texts to form the story of the origins of the world and the people of Israel. Critics like Matthew Michael pointed out his assumptions that Pentateuch is the work of a single author who for sure to him used other sources for the composition of the so-called Pentateuch today. He further stated that the hypothesis to him are fictions because JEDP hypothesis are saying the same thing, however the writer does not know why he insisted on calling the hypothesis, fictions if his fictions mean not really, except he redefines, without any concrete reason because no one knows maybe tomorrow fiction may turn to faction and Michael and others may be suppressed. However, to the researcher imagination, Researcher is too sceptical to call them fiction but rather unreliable imaginations hypothesis for now. But you can develop your own imagination if you imagine yourself to have better hypothesis then JEDP.

4. Imaginative Mosaic Authorship of Deuteronomy 34

Arguments against the Mosaic Authorship of Deuteronomy 34

This is another problematic artistic argument in the Pentateuch, in fact, the writer envisioned that it is very easy for us to accept the entire Pentateuch as a mosaic documents but make an exclusion of Deuteronomy 34. Prompted by the Middle Ages, scholars began to reason out, especially historical critics, that it was not possible for Moses to write the account of his own death (Deuteronomy 34:5-12). Rationally, it is quite problematic among conservative and liberal scholars for someone to say Deuteronomy 34 was written by Moses. However, others see no sense for scholars that are still arguing about the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy 34, especially historical-

critical scholars, because no one historically has ever written the volume of events that took place after his departure in this physical and reasonable consciousness of the human body. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the ghost of Moses wrote anything after his death during the Israelite history. So, it appears that at the beginning, what is now called the book of Deuteronomy was originally made up of several different literary pieces that Moses handed to the priests, and then at one point, maybe these priests, or someone else, then coupled those speeches that Moses had written and handed to them, and gave us the book of Deuteronomy.

The description of Moses' death in Deuteronomy is seen as the most problematic issue for someone to talk about in the Mosaic authorship of chapter 34. In fact, some Evangelicals and Conservatives suggest that Moses' successor, Joshua, completed Deuteronomy 34. Thompson asserted that probably no one today would argue that Deuteronomy was entirely the work of Moses, although writers in former centuries attempted to show that Moses could have written of his own death by divine inspiration. No one knows why Thompson disagreed with even divine inspiration; no one also knows whether he really has the fact that someone has written that instead of Moses.

Critics charge that the account in Deuteronomy 34 recording Moses' death is an obvious proof that Moses did not write the Pentateuch/Deuteronomy. However, one must remember that it was common practice in that day for a successor of the prophet to append a final chapter onto his predecessor's writings. "Such scholars as R. D. Wilson, Merrill Unger, Douglas Young, R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and R. K. Harrison easily accept that the final chapter of Deuteronomy was likely appended by Joshua or someone else in Moses' inner circle." The Jewish Talmud was also not in agreement that Moses must have written Deuteronomy 34 but rather asserted that his successor Joshua wrote the chapter. Surprisingly, Eugene Merrill places himself within that circle by his claim that, it is obvious that some of these places names are later additions to the text (e.g., Dan, Naphtali, Ephraim, and Manasseh, Judah) inasmuch as they would not have been assigned to these sites until after the conquest, some years following Moses' death.

5. Imaginative Arguments for Mosaic Authorship of Deuteronomy 34

The assumptions of the Mosaic authorship of the Deuteronomy 34, for sure, will make no sense on the ground of scientific assumptions. However, there are also imaginations that Moses did write Deuteronomy 34 but the reasonable and the acceptability of the

ingenuities depend on your thoughts whether your thoughts will be supportive or opposing the imaginations of Moses been the author. Many anti-mosaic authorship scholars imagined that some of the geographical details represented in Deuteronomy 34 were beyond the knowledge of Moses. Surprisingly, the issue of places that were conquered by Israel after the death of Moses might or would not be unknown to Moses. Because Deuteronomy 33:23 is against scholars who are agitating that Moses could not have known such names. Moses himself ties Naphtali to a specific location within the Promised Land (“take possession of the area south of the lake”). Unless Moses suffered some category of blow that left him mentally incapacitated immediately after he had delivered his final blessing in Deuteronomy 33, he certainly had a clear understanding of the post-conquest lay of the land. To deny Moses’ knowledge of the geography of Canaan (even though he personally had never been there) would not only require that his final blessing was not actually spoken by him but would also require that extensive portions of Genesis be removed from his authorship. While various geographical data have been proposed as post-Mosaic from time to time, it is difficult to prove the case one way or the other.

The assumptions may be self-proclaimed that editorial hints happened in the post-Mosaic period but it is not easy to prove which of those proposed are genuinely post-Mosaic. Among those scholars who maintain essentially Mosaic authorship opinions vary as to the precise extent of the post-Mosaic in Deuteronomy. Ronald Allen admits that it “is theoretically possible that Moses might have authored such a line under inspiration, just as it is possible that he might have recorded the account of his death and burial by prophetic insight (Deut. 34). These things are possible but not likely.” Except these imaginations should only focus on the scientific historical ground, without the theological understanding of the act of God in history, the same God that used the prophets to write the events which they never witnessed before they died. It is possible for that God of the covenant, who is Omniscient to have used Moses who for sure wrote the book of Genesis to also have penned the events that took place after his death in Deuteronomy 34 without any hands of his successors, even Joshua. But nowhere in the Bible is it said he did or did not inspire Moses to write about his death. Imaginatively, most of the periscopes of the Pentateuch arrangement are prophetic. For illustration, the death of Jacob, the death of exodus generation in Numbers 25-26 and also the end of ancestral stories in Genesis 50, also the creation of the cosmos and humanity. The writer picturing all of these must have been written by the prophetic imagination of Yahweh to his servant or servants depending on your thoughts. However, to the researcher’s thoughts, Deuteronomy 34 is

not excluded from these prophetic scriptural periscopes which Moses stands a reliable chance of writing.

6. Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch

Arguments against Mosaic Authorship

Apart from the Wellhausen's source criticism of Pentateuch anti-mosaic authorship and Deuteronomy 34, there are other imaginations developed from Wellhausen group of scholars like, The Californian Professor, Richard Elliot Friedman, who assumed that, "At present . . . there is hardly a biblical scholar in the world actively working on the problem who would claim that the Five Books of Moses were written by Moses – or by any one person." That the problem was not only just the hypotheses themselves but also the writing styles differ from one another, like P source is unique and easily discernable from the J and E sources, that some of the passages like Gen. 1:1 – 2:4a and Genesis 5 where the writing style is "solemn and majestic," "repetitive," "uses stereotype idioms," "balanced structures," and "appeals to the intellect." These passages are differing from Gen. 2:4b – 4:26 where the style is described as "artistic," "picturesque," and "appeals to the imagination;" all these writing styles mean different authors with a certain type of subject matter.

The Pentateuch seems to reflect substantially, Moses and what Moses wrote when he was leading God's people towards the Promised Land. But if one learns Hebrew and study the Pentateuch, one of the things one will find is that the Hebrew actually reflects a later time. In agreement with this anti-mosaic scholars agitating that the historical books of the Old Testament do not show anywhere Israel is following the law of the Pentateuch, so those laws might have been written later. In fact, many of the theological ideas and the Pentateuch laws are too advanced to have been written at the time of Moses. Most of the Aramaic words and grammatical forms in part of the Pentateuch show that they must have been written in a later age, such as the exile, when the Aramaic language was taking over the language of Hebrew people.

Brigham Young, although he repeatedly asserted his biblical allegiance, emphasized the circumstantial and progressive nature of revelation, dismissing parts of the Bible as fables or "baby stories," and noting that, in the writing of the creation story, Moses adapted the traditions he had inherited from the fathers. the scholars suggesting oral sagas insisted that, While materials which the author used for the composition of this book no doubt

came to him from five to six centuries before his time, prior to Jacob's migration into Egypt, nevertheless Moses seems to have served as a Spirit-guided compiler and interpreter of the pre-existent material which had come to him from his forebears in oral and written forms. Fuller asserted that "Walhausen believed Moses would have been too primitive to have written the Pentateuch because he did not even know how to write."

Arguments for Mosaic Authorship

The existence of the man Moses is not historical for now; there is no archaeological evidence about the existence of Moses except the traditional memory of historical imaginations of the people of Israel (Old Testament). Professors Finskeitain & Silberman asserted that Moses deliverance of the people of Israel from bondage is a brilliant human imagination. The issue of the authorship has to be granted in that imagination. Therefore, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is traditional memory imaginations of Israel that Moses author the Pentateuch. Many Biblical scholars are not in support of this image that the Pentateuch did not claim the entire authorship of Moses. In fact, others look at those that hold the imagination of Mosaic authorship as not been critical but been dogmatic in there thinking. Against this view, Young summarized his thoughts in this way when it is affirmed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, which does not mean that he himself necessarily wrote every word. He might have employed parts of previously existing written documents. He furthers, also, under divine inspiration, there might have been later minor additions and even revisions. Substantially and essentially, however, it is the product of Moses. McDowell goes on to imagined and list some qualifications that prepared Moses for authoring the Pentateuch, including education, tradition, geographical familiarity, and time. In addition, historically and spiritually, as a prophet of God in Israel and academically as an educated man in Egypt, he was capable of writing the entire Pentateuch. Not only the New Testament but also the Jewish Hebrew Bible memory assigns the Pentateuch to Mosaic authorship.

Scholars claimed that the Hebrew language began to borrow Aramaic words during the exile, but archaeologists discovered that the two languages influenced each other from the earliest time. Such words claimed to be borrowed are known to be from other sources.

Hartley asserted that, Genesis must be the work of an editor or editors who collected patriarchs' tradition and arranged them to one account but he also imagined that the text did not mention the editor but Moses by training, interest and time, during the year the

Israelite camped near Kadesh-Barnea to do the work, should be the editor. Accordingly, he maintained that the usage of Elohim and Yahweh is Divine self-identification to Moses personally according to Exodus 3:16, 3:13-15 and Exodus 6:13 which the name Yahweh imagined not to be known by the ancestors and the occurrences of the name must come from Moses. However, yes it is a fact that Moses really stands exclusive author by his qualifications but Hartley's mention of even the site where Moses sat and edited the book of Genesis lacks biblical evidence and archaeological authentication.

There are proofs within the Pentateuch itself that Moses was the author. For example, Exodus 24:4 states that Moses wrote everything he said. Deut. 31:9 says, "So Moses wrote down this law." Deut. 31:24 declares, "After Moses finished writing in a book the words of this law from beginning to end." There are other books of the Hebrew Bible or Old Testament that regarded the Pentateuch as the Law of Moses. Also, Joshua told the people, "Be careful to obey all that is written in the Book of the Law of Moses" (Josh. 23:6a). In addition, others also called it the Law of Moses: "And they installed the priests in their divisions and the Levites in their groups for the service of God at Jerusalem, according to what is written in the Book of Moses (Ezra 6:18). Leviticus 26:46 states, "These are the decrees, the laws and the regulations that the LORD established on Mount Sinai between himself and the Israelites through Moses" Joshua (1:7-8), Kings (I Kings 2-3, II Kings 23:21 and 25), Chronicles (II Chronicles 8:13, 34:14 and 35:12), Ezra (3:2 and 6:18) and Nehemiah (8:1 and 13:1) all contain verses implying belief in the Mosaic authorship of the Torah, indicating that the belief possibly existed during the time of Joshua. His book is traditionally said to have been written around the 1300's BC. Also, because the belief in the Mosaic authorship is found in the book of Nehemiah, it can be certain that this belief existed during the Post-Exilic period.

Nevertheless, the Old Testament nowhere ever called the name of someone as the writer of the Pentateuch apart from Moses, who was spiritually and intellectually capable for the composition of the Pentateuch with different styles. How reliable will our thoughts be if we will claim that those that mentioned the book of Moses within the Pentateuch do not mean the whole Pentateuch, I do not know if that will be true? In the New Testament, the memory of the traditional image of mosaic authorship started with the incarnated God – Jesus Christ who supported the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. In Mark 7:10 Jesus assigned the Ten Commandments to Moses saying, "For Moses said, 'Honor your father and your mother.'" Also, in the issue of the burning bush, Jesus quoted Moses for calling the names of the patriarchs' God, by saying, God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Luke 20:37). However, with all these biblical pieces of evidence about the Mosaic authorship,

if Moses were not the author, then this is not because of the evidence from the documentary hypothesis, styles or even Deuteronomy 34.

As far as the Pentateuch is concerned, the majority of evangelical scholars will continue to call it the five books of Moses the man of God. In agreement with this Norman asserted that historically, Jewish and Christian scholars have credited Moses with the authorship of the Pentateuch. According to Wolf most of the materials that argue about the post-mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch are few, however, the Pentateuch might eventually have been written by Moses or under his supervision. Wolf pointed out that the entire Pentateuch is all about the events that involve Moses than any person in the Bible. Lois Edward articulates, it is demandable for Israel to have the historical record of their life events which must have to be written by Moses who was the only outstanding person to pen that record down. If Moses, who is eminently qualified on the basis of his background, training, and role as founding leader of ancient Israel religion, was not the author of the Pentateuch, then one greater than Moses must be the author not assumptions of Wellhausen's theories.

7. Concluding remarks

The Documentary hypotheses helps us to imagine the facts and to investigate more imaginations about the authorship of the Pentateuch, which is very helpful for scholarship and for our faith in the entire Bible. Anti-mosaic scholars must know that the documentary hypotheses are just imaginative excesses that are allowed by scholars that Moses must not have written the Pentateuch, for there is no adequate documentary fact to support their claims. Therefore, believing them is like believing in non-existing assumption, while believing in the biblical internal and external pieces of evidence is like believing in divine inspiration if you want to. Fuller asserted that documentary hypothesis in many respects is outdated and needless for the scholarship. The writer does not really agree with the fuller verdict but the fact is it seems like many scholars are not interested in the hypothesis anymore. It is moving to the period which scholars are going to look at some of the so-called 'diversity' by some conservative, Liberal and even evangelical scholars who are now against the Mosaic authorship, to see the entire Pentateuch as a literary unity of the whole Book. Scholars are admitting that the books use common words, phrases and motifs, parallel narrative structures, and deliberate theological arrangement of literary units for teaching and memorization support viewing the five books as a literary whole.

Some source critics are now picturing that the entire documentary Hypothesis JEDP is more of the priestly writer or compeller voice and if possible should emerge in the priestly document because they are all about Holiness and law courts. Then, the writer imagined in their views that if that is acceptable and possible, which is acceptable to the writer, then one person should be the reliable imaginative author of the entire Pentateuch which Moses stands a chance as a great prince before the institutional prince-hood. However, if anti-mosaic (imaginative) authorship scholars are with the opinion that for someone to be the author of a document he must be an eye witness of all events he penned down, without divine inspiration and oral passing peroration, then the writer has no option than to envisage, to fathom and succumb after retrospect and prospect documentary events about Moses' life, by concurring with them that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch but only a compiler if he really was or we should situate him as plagiarist of other documents, depending on your imaginations either to follow biblical imagination of mosaic authorship of the whole or some parts of the Pentateuch or you follow source critics whose documentary hypothesis only exist in the imaginations of their mind and heads without any documentary imaginative support which, to the writer thoughts, is not reliable. Once one imagined like Wellhausen School of taught that supernatural cannot occur any other explanation must take precedent. If the authorship is all about imaginations than there should be a reliable one if you agree, then depends on your imaginative Judgments either to said yes Moses wrote the Pentateuch completely and be called a traditional imaginations' believer or say no and be call a critical natural imaginations' believer but the writer said YES HE DID with a biased and subjective mind as the biased and subjective scholars insisted on their "subjective" fancies that he did not. Thank you.

Sources

Allen, Ronald B. "Numbers," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, 1990.

Allis, O T. *The Five Books of Moses*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1949.

Archer, G. L. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Moody Press: Chicago, 1998.

Archer, Gleason L. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1975.

Awokoya, S.O. David. *The Pentateuch: Studies in the Old Testament*. Ibadan: Masterpiece, 2014.

Craigie, Peter C. *The Book of Deuteronomy, New International Commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1976.

Douglas, J.D. (ed.). *New International Bible Dictionary Encyclopedia*, reverse edition. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.1979.

Edwards, Jonathan. *Notes on Scripture*, The Works of Jonathan Edwards, Vol. 15, ed. Stephen J. Stein. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Friedman, Richard Elliot. *Who Wrote the Bible?* New York: Summit Books, 1987.

Fuller, Lois. *The Pentateuch*.Bukuru: ACTS, 2015.

Geisler, Norman L. *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books,1999.

Geisler, Norman L. and Nix, William E.A *General Introduction to the Bible*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1986.

Habel, Norman. *Literary Criticism of the Pentateuch*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1971.

nj

Hasel, Gerhard F. *Biblical Interpretation Today*. USA: NW Washington, 1985.

Hill, Andrew. & Walton, John H.A *Survey of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1991.

Lason, Sandford William *et al. Old Testament Survey*. Grand Rapids Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.1982.

Merrill, Eugene H. *Deuteronomy, The New American Commentary*, vol. 4. Nashville, Tenn: Broadman& Holman Publishers, 1994.

Third Millennium Ministries, *Introduction to Pentateuch; Bible Education for the world*. Casselberry: Third Millennium Ministries,2014.

Thompson, J. A. *Deuteronomy: An Introduction and Commentary*, The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974.

Whybray,R. Norman. *Introduction to the Pentateuch*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company,1999.

Wolf, Herbert. *An Introduction to the Old Testament Pentateuch*.Chicago, Ill.: Moody Press, 1991.

Young, Edward J. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1949.