

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1897.

ART. I.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

No. X.

BEFORE proceeding further, I wish to supply an omission in my critical analysis of Gen. ix. In vers. 15-17 we have the mention of a covenant between God and "every living creature of all flesh." As, *ex hypothesi*, P is the writer who is specially charged with the task of emphasizing the distinction between the Jews and every other nation under heaven, it is not a little surprising to find these verses, insisting as they do on the contrary doctrine of the brotherhood of humanity, assigned to P. Here the linguistic and the theological *criteria* of the subjective school are entirely opposed to one another. בְּרֵית וְרֵבָה, לְאֶבְרָהָם, שְׂרֵיץ, "everlasting covenant," and the like, are declared by Professor Driver ("Introduction," pp. 123, 124) to be clear indications of the style of P in chap. ix. But on p. 121 he points out how "in P the promises to the patriarchs are *limited to Israel itself*."¹ "The establishment of a covenant with" the "members" of "the Abrahamic clan" (p. 122) is, he adds, a special characteristic of P's teaching. "Utrum horum mavis accipe." Either P's style or his principles are at fault here. Either the author of P has forgotten the object for which he was writing, or the linguistic characteristics of P have been falsely attributed to him. Once more, therefore, the need of a closer and fuller investigation than is contained in the flimsy assertions made with so much confidence is demonstrated. It is unquestionable that the post-exilic period was that in which the distinction between Jew and Gentile was emphasized to its fullest extent. If P be the work of a separate author, and if this author wrote in post-exilic times, it is certain that it is

¹ The italics are his.

not to him that we should look for the special mention of a covenant between God and all mankind.

The description of the confusion of tongues, and its reason, in chap. xi. seems again to present strongly archaic features. Such a narrative was hardly likely to have been composed in the days of the early kings of Judah. Whether we regard it as historic, or as a legend invented to account for the origin of various languages, it is impossible for the scientific historic investigator to assign it to so late a date as this.¹ If history, it is of course authentic tradition; if legend, the form of the legend is distinctly that of a period anterior to such a civilization as that of the days of David and Solomon. But our principal business is with P. To this narrative vers. 10-27 are assigned. And if the Hiphil of לָרַב be indeed the characteristic sign of a special author, which I have given some reasons for believing was not the case,² the severance goes on so far "as merrily as marriage-bells." But those bells become a little "out of tune and harsh" by the sudden stoppage in ver. 28. The narrative here is flowing enough. "These are the generations of Terah. Terah begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran, and Haran begat Lot. And Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees." *Primâ facie*, there is no sign of dislocation here; but the fiat has gone forth that vers. 28-30 are the work of JE.³ Once more, why? There are no linguistic features in the passage to indicate difference of authorship. The facts recorded are in harmony with the rest of the narrative. There are no theological reasons why a severance should be made. One singular fact may be noticed in passing. Sarai is said here (by JE, remember) to be "barren," to have "had no child." A similar statement in chap. xvi. is assigned to P, though the words which follow, "and she had a handmaid," etc., are assigned to JE, and this though they are in close and necessary connection with what precedes. To this passage, however, we shall return. Our present object is only to show the remarkable arbitrariness of the so-called criticism. Moreover, the redactor has here once more left out some portions of JE; for as the latter says that Haran "died before his father Terah in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees," there must have been some mention of Terah in his narrative. Why has not the redactor

¹ Wellhausen ("Comp. des Hex.," p. 16) admits the composite character of JE here, and Kautzsch and Socin look on xi. 1-9 as forming part of an earlier source of J. Professor Driver is silent on this point.

² CHURCHMAN for 1896, pp. 343, 344; for 1897, p. 450.

³ It may be well to mention the portions of chaps. xi.-xiii. assigned to P. They are as follows: xi. 10-27, 31, 32; xii. 4b, 5; xiii. 6, 11b, 12a. But see next page, note.

given it? Why, moreover, has he patched this little piece of JE into the consecutive narrative of P (vers. 10-27, 31, 32)? No reason is or can be given which can bear a moment's investigation. We may further remark that here the redactor is in his exact and rational mood, for he never once speaks of Abram as Abraham, or Sarai as Sarah, until chap. xvii., which is entirely assigned to P. Nor does he ever afterwards call either of them by their original name. And from this a further conclusion follows, that either JE and P must each have recognised, and in all probability have narrated, the striking event recorded in chap. xvii.; or the "mere compiler," who inserts the history, and frequently makes no attempt to harmonize the most glaring contradictions, must have carefully written Sarah for Sarai all through the portions of JE he inserted after chap. xvii., or Sarai for Sarah in every mention of her *before* that chapter. Again, it is indifferent to us which hypothesis is adopted. It is difficult to say which of the two is the more improbable.¹

Some other singular results follow from the compilation theory in this and the next chapter. It is necessary to explain that in chap. xii. only the latter part of ver. 4 as well as ver. 5 are assigned to P. Our first discovery is that on the compilation hypothesis JE never brings Abraham and his family into Canaan at all. They *are* there, but they never *get* there. It is not until P's history is published that we learn their destination, and some particulars of their journey. All JE tells us is that Jehovah said to Abraham that he was to go to "a land that I will show thee." Our next information from JE is that Abraham is already in "the land," and that "the Canaanite" was also there. Then we find P assuming, not narrating, the death of Haran (xi. 31; xii. 5). It is to be observed that he does this twice. Now, it is impossible that P can have failed to record the death of Haran. Therefore, the fact that his words are not inserted disposes of the idea that we have *the whole* of P embodied in the narrative. Consequently, all the arguments—and they are both numerous and important—founded on what P omits or does not contain are utterly beside the mark. For if the redactor does not insert the whole of his account, how can we possibly tell what he omits or takes no notice of? The same must be said of JE. But if this be true, a large portion of the argument in Professor Driver's "Intro-

¹ Wellhausen, however ("Comp. des Hex.," p. 4), attributes chap. xi. 17-32, save ver. 29, to Q (P). "This," he says, "is a complete, clear, and established connection." Nevertheless, Professor Driver, presumably following Kautzsch and Socin, departs from it without a single word of explanation. Truly the ways of the critics are inscrutable.

duction" collapses like a house of cards.¹ And we may also ask once more why that astonishing person, the redactor, has treated his authorities in this extremely eccentric fashion.

Another trifling point, yet not without significance, is the statement in P that Terah "took" Abram his son, as well as Sarai and Lot, to Haran. JE (in chap. xii. 1-4) says that this was on account of a revelation to Abram. If the narrative be homogeneous (and no sufficient argument has been adduced to the contrary), we have here, instead of a contradiction, a touching insight into the unity of sentiment prevailing in Terah's family at that time. Abram was undoubtedly the leading mind. To him were all the Divine communications made. But his family firmly believed them, and were all ready to act on them. The dissection theory destroys ruthlessly all the subtle touches which have made the history in Genesis so natural, so interesting, and so profitable to generation after generation of Jews and Christians. It does more. It makes the whole history of the migration of Abram, his father, and his family unintelligible.

But we now come to a more remarkable evidence of unity of authorship. We learn from P that Terah and his family arrived in Haran, and that after the death of Terah Abram (chap. xii. 5, 6) removed thence to Canaan. No mention of Nahor is made in either narrative.² Nor does JE refer to any stay at Haran. In chap. xxii. 20-24 (JE) we have a mention of Nahor's family, which included Bethuel. In xxiv. 10 (JE) we have a mention of the "city of Nahor." But in chap. xxvii. 43 (JE) we are further informed that this city was *Haran*, for Laban, Bethuel's son, was living there. Therefore Nahor stayed behind in Haran. Now, in the part of the narrative we are at present considering, it is remarkable that JE *never once mentions Haran*. The mention is *confined to P*. Therefore we have here a most striking undesigned confirmation on the part of JE of the accuracy of P's narrative, or, rather, in reality, a proof that there is in our narrative no such thing at all as a "mere compilation" of two separate histories by a redactor. Moreover, Professor Driver's argument about "Paddan-Aram" being a special characteristic of P also goes by the board. He contends ("Introduction," p. 128) that "J says Aram-naharaim." So he does in chap. xxiv. 10. But he also speaks there of the "city of Nahor." And he *calls this city Haran* in Gen. xxvii. 43.³ And so does P in

¹ I find Professor Hommel ("Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 290) using precisely the same expression of Wellhausen.

² It is necessary now and then to remind the reader that it is not admitted that there are two narratives. The point is only assumed for argument's sake.

³ So also in xxviii. 10; xxix. 4.

Gen. xi. 31; xii. 4, 5.¹ So we see that full and careful examination of the facts tends to disclose a good many things in the Pentateuch which are unknown to Professor Driver's philosophy. Assertions have been made pretty freely on this subject, and the assertions have a very imposing look until they are subjected to criticism. There are many other assertions which have seemed irrefragable to those who have made them and to their docile disciples, which will also disappear when subjected to rigorous investigation. Some have been remarked upon already. Others will receive notice in due time. The truth is that nothing is easier than first of all to make your assumptions in regard to the phrases characteristic of the authors into which you have divided your history, and then to proceed to your severance according to your assumptions. And the thing, no doubt, has been most cleverly, laboriously, and thoroughly done—done so as to make the task of refutation extremely difficult.² But our German neighbours, unfortunately for themselves, have carried out their work of dissection, not by a careful study of the history, but too often by the help of a Hebrew concordance. And this time it has misled them. It could not be otherwise. However completely the scheme may be contrived, awkward little gaps must necessarily be left here and there through which the spear of the genuine critic can penetrate. And one of the most awkward is the one we are now considering. It is extremely irritating, no doubt, for "Paddan-Aram" had been so carefully marked off throughout as a special characteristic of P, and Haran, as well as Aram-naharaim, as belonging to JE. But

"The best laid schemes of mice and men
Gang aft agley."

So I am afraid the analytic critics will have to go to work again. Let them take my advice, and boldly assign Gen. xi. 31, 32, and xii. 4, 5, to JE. There is no reason whatever why they should not do so—no reason whatever, in fact, why these verses should be assigned to any one author rather than another. And then Professor Driver can continue triumphantly to assert that "Paddan-Aram" is an invariable

¹ It is to be remarked that while Gen. xxviii. 1-9, where Laban's dwelling is said to be at Paddan-Aram, is assigned to P, the rest of the chapter, for no particular reason, except that Laban's home is said to be Haran in *ver.* 11, is assigned to JE! Half of chap. xxxi. 18 is assigned to P in the midst of a narrative assigned to JE, because *Paddan-Aram occurs in it!* The same is done in xxxiii. 18. In xlvi. 7, Paddan is assigned by Kautzsch and Socin to the redactor!

² This assumes that the critics are agreed down to the minutest detail. But they are not. And the very slightest difference, as may be seen here, may involve the most important consequences. Unless this kind of criticism be absolutely infallible, it is almost absolutely worthless.

characteristic of P, and Haran and Aram-naharaim of JE, and nobody can contradict him! Perhaps such a course might hardly be consistent with the great principle of the infallibility of the critics. But I am afraid it is the only way out of rather a serious difficulty. And so easy a mode of escape is it, that though extremely merciful, it is perhaps a little injudicious on my part to suggest it.¹

Another singular conclusion of the modern critics is that which assigns to JE *all the three* stories which represent Abraham and Isaac as passing off Sarah and Rebekah respectively as their sisters, under the pressure of extreme danger. If ever there were a circumstance which displays the capricious temper of the modern critic in its strongest colours, it is this. If ever there were an instance in the Pentateuch of the embodying into one history accounts from different sources, it is here. Yet two of these stories are assigned to J and one to E, the latter of which, by hypothesis, or, rather, by extorted and reluctant admission, has been incorporated with the former by a later editor.

The whole of chap. xiii., with the exception of ver. 6, and vers. 11b and 12a, is attributed to JE. One special feature of the chapter is the prominence assigned to Lot. This falls in well enough with the theory of unity of authorship of Genesis. But if we accept the modern critic's hypothesis, it is strange that only the most casual mention of Lot is found previously in JE (xii. 4). It is the so-called P which takes pains to indicate the important part Lot is to play in the subsequent history. As in the case of Noah, so here, the historian takes care to give a fitting introduction to one of his more prominent characters. Lot is first of all (xi. 27) mentioned in the genealogy (P) as the son of Haran. Then he is mentioned as having accompanied Terah and Abram to Haran (P), and afterwards as having accompanied Abram to Canaan. The modern critic (1) deprives the history of all its little artistic touches, (2) it makes JE take only the slightest notice beforehand of a person of whom it has many important details to record, and (3) it represents P as marking adequately the importance in the subsequent history of a person of whom it has nothing to say; for the only mention of Lot in P after this chapter is to be found in chap. xix. 29. The latest critics increase this improbability by striking out the words, "and Lot went with him" from JE, and assigning them to the redactor.²

¹ Professor Hommel (p. 206) thinks that the country came to bear the name Paddan-Aram between the period of Abraham and that of Jacob.

² For my readers' sake, I will give P's history of Lot subsequent to its mention of him in xi. 31, 32, and xii. 4b, 5: "And the land was not able to bear them [whom?] that they might dwell together, for their substance was great, so that they could not dwell together. And they separated

When we come to the supposed insertion of a verse from P between vers. 5 and 7 (JE), we are struck (1) with the fact that it is required in order to explain the strife between the herdsmen of Lot and those of Abraham, and (2) that once more something must have been omitted from P, since the word "them," being a pronoun, presumably (unless the critics are "reges, et super grammaticum") requires some nouns to which it refers. The nouns are only to be found in JE, so that once more we are reminded of the utter untrustworthiness of any argument based on what P does not contain.¹ We conclude our literary analysis of this passage by appealing to any rational person whether the narrative in chaps. xi.-xiii., as it stands, is not as smooth and flowing and as coherent and consistent in all its parts as a narrative can be, and whether there exist any reasons whatever for its dissection into the work of various authors in the way the critics have suggested?²

themselves the one from the other; Abram dwelled in the land of Canaan, and Lot dwelled in the cities of the plain. And it came to pass, when God destroyed the cities of the plain, that God remembered Abraham, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when He overthrew the cities in which Lot dwelt." The next sentence of P it may be well to add: "And" *some one* (Jehovah here is an *editorial correction!*) "did unto Sarah as He had spoken," in ch. xvii. 15-21.

¹ A similar passage is to be found in ch. xxxvi. 7; but this has carefully been assigned to P.

² It may be well to note how Wellhausen treats P's (or Q, as he calls it) contribution to chaps. xii.-xxvi. ("Die Composition des Hexateuchs," pp. 16, 17). In a work devoted to ascertaining the sources of the Pentateuch, he offers *no arguments whatever* in support of his assertion that the passages we have mentioned are to be assigned to P, nor does he give references to any other author, unless we except some rather startling conclusions from a supposed contradiction between the narratives of JE and P. In support of this, in order to exaggerate the age of Ishmael, he insists that Isaac was weaned three years after his birth. Where he obtains this information it is impossible to say, though in Macc. vii. 27 a mother speaks of herself as having given her son suck for three years. Then he tells us that Ishmael, who must have been seventeen years of age, is represented in ch. xxi. (J) as an infant unable to help himself, as if the narrative did not plainly attribute his helplessness to the wandering in the wilderness until all their food was spent (xxi. 15). Finally, he has the effrontery to invert the words of his author thus: ואת-הילך שם על שכמה (the lad he put on her shoulder), instead of referring the putting on the shoulder to the bread and skin of water, which, as well as the lad, Abraham gave to Hagar. It was the former, not the latter, which he put on her shoulder (שם על שכמה ואת הילך). And this is done in order to lead us to suppose that, according to JE, Ishmael was "ein spielendes Kind." Dr. Baxter has sufficiently exposed the reckless inaccuracy—I might say dishonesty—of Wellhausen; but I doubt if he has quoted any instance more glaring than this. Beyond it there is not a shred of proof of any kind in support of his assertions in regard to the portions of the story assigned to P. And then he tells us that Q's (P's) narrative is handled "in a very step-motherly fashion" in reference to

In regard to linguistic criticism there is not much to be said. But it is worthy of remark that, in addition to the obvious continuity of the narrative as a whole, ver. 11b (P) is absolutely required by the context in ver. 9 (JE). **יִפְרְדוּ נָא מֵעָלַי** ("Separate, I pray thee, from me"), says Abram in the narrative supposed to have formed part of JE. **וַיִּפְרְדוּ** (and they separated), says P. What reasonable person would doubt that these two passages were written by the same hand? And then we have the unusual word **כֶּבֶךְ** (anything round and flat, as a cake), applied by both JE and P to the region in which Sodom and Gomorrah were situated. No one would assert that the use of this word *proves* identity of authorship. But unquestionably it tends to support that identity rather than otherwise.¹

Since these words were written, the third "finger of a man's hand," which announces the approaching downfall of the subjective school of criticism, has appeared in the shape of Professor Hommel's "Ancient Hebrew Tradition Illustrated by the Monuments."² It is not necessary to commit ourselves to Professor Hommel's conclusions. They may all be wrong. The science of Biblical Archæology is in its infancy, and it is quite possible that fuller investigation may lead to altogether different conclusions than those to be found in this learned work. The importance of Professor Hommel's pronouncement is not in his conclusions, but in his absolute renunciation of the *methods* of the subjective critics. As he says, those methods of minute analysis depend for their correctness on the assumption that little or no modification in the text of the Old Testament has taken place since the "redactor" did his work at least two centuries before the Christian era. Everyone knows how large an assumption this is, but "it is unquestionable," he declares, "that the higher critics have gone virtually bankrupt in their attempt to unravel, not only chapter by chapter, but verse by verse, and clause by clause, the web in which the different sources are entangled, arguing

the original sources of the patriarchal history. But we have already seen (above, pp. 617, 621) how much ground there is for the supposition that if there be such a narrative as P, the whole of it has been given. There has been at least an attempt in these papers to examine the narrative linguistically as well as historically. The vaunted German criticism, on the contrary, consists in appropriating, almost without note or comment, the conclusions of someone else. And the discovery of supposed "sources" is based on the wholesale manufacture of contradictions after the manner just indicated.

¹ The phrase occurs in the portions assigned to JE in xiii. 10, 11, and in xix. 17, 25, 28. In P it is found in xiii. 12 and xix. 29. It occurs eight times in the Pentateuch, and only five times elsewhere, and only once is used of any place but the vicinity of Jordan.

² Lately published by the S.P.C.K.

frequently from premises which are entirely false."¹ He refers to a book by Professor Green, with which I lament that I have not met, and describes the "pitiless logic" with which the latter has exposed the weak points of his opponents' case,² and the "hair-splitting" and "atom-dividing," as Professor Klostermann has called them, to which these critics resort. He speaks also³ of "brushing aside the cobweb theories of the so-called 'higher critics' of the Pentateuch," and of "leaving such old-fashioned theories behind us."

It must have been obvious to every man who had time to think that these castles in the air were destined in the end to disappear, and, "like the baseless fabric of a vision, leave not a wrack behind." The only mystery is how they could so long have held their ground and have obtained so wide an acceptance. The secret is that they seemed to offer a way of escape from difficulties which were pressing heavily on men's minds. Unfortunately, though that way was extremely convenient and opportunely offered, it was the wrong one. In these papers an endeavour has been made to show the arbitrariness and fancifulness of the methods adopted by critics of this sort, as well as the danger of the conclusion, imputing, as it did, misrepresentation, forgery, and fraud, to the writers of the Old Testament. The principles of historical or literary investigation which I have followed are precisely those adopted by Professor Hommel. I have never desired, any more than he has done, to lay it down as an article of faith either that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, or that it was written by one author, or that it was as necessary to believe in the accuracy of every detail it contains as in the incarnation or resurrection of Jesus Christ. All that has been contended for is that the German criticism is often extremely arbitrary, that it has often gone very seriously wrong, that its mode of arriving at the sources of the history is absolutely untrustworthy, that in the Old Testament we have a history of Israel at least as credible and correct as the histories of other countries are, that the Jews neither falsified their history themselves nor allowed other persons to do so, but that the traditions of their race were as scrupulously guarded and as intelligently handed down as those of other peoples. It might seem almost to be slaying the slain to continue these researches when men of such mark as Professors Green, Sayce, and Hommel have flung down the gauntlet to the so-called "higher critics." Yet perhaps it may be as well

¹ Page 19.

² In "The Unity of the Book of Genesis," New York, 1895.

³ Preface, p. xii.

to proceed. Even Professor Hommel has not apparently shaken himself sufficiently free from the fascinations of the theory of an Elohist and a Jehovist. Astruc may claim the peculiar honour of having put a century and a half of investigators on a false scent. For myself, I must believe the notion that the words "Elohim" and "Jehovah" are characteristic of different authors to be altogether untenable. Professor Klostermann's suggestion that an Elohist and a Jehovistic scribe have respectively at some very early period copied out portions of the narrative in Genesis is far more likely in itself, and gives a far more probable explanation of the phenomena. But the sources of Genesis are undoubtedly Babylonian records and tradition coloured by monotheistic ideas for the first eleven chapters, and for the rest, written or oral traditions of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, handed down among their descendants. That foreign elements have to a certain extent commingled with these sources seems clear. Abraham's second marriage with Keturah seems due to one of these. The mention of his "concubines" would seem to be another. Another, I think there is ground for supposing, is to be found in the genealogies, which, as I trust we shall hereafter see, present some special features of their own. Another is the account of the death of Isaac. It seems extremely improbable that he should have lingered so many years in the state in which he is depicted in Gen. xxvii. The historical accuracy of the tradition has apparently been obscured during some centuries of oral transmission. But one thing has long been to me perfectly clear, and recent archæological investigation has rendered it clearer: whether we analyse the literary phenomena of Genesis, or treat its contents on the principles of comparative historical study, or examine the archæological treasures so lately brought to light, the result will be the same—the subjective criticism will be discredited and ultimately destroyed.

J. J. LIAS.



ART. II.—ROME'S DEPARTURE FROM PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE.

THE student of Church history, who carefully examines the existing records, is easily able to understand the relative positions of the Churches of England and of Rome in the struggles which weakened, and frequently almost shattered, the fabric both of Church and State in this country. It will not be denied that again and again the Bishops of Rome made the most strenuous efforts to gain an ascendancy over, and to