generally and from other points of view with Loisy's synthesis of Christianity, and shall compare it with the familiar rival scheme propounded by Harnack.

ARTHUR C. JENNINGS.

ART. III.—THE BOOK OF GENESIS (*continued*).

THE next point which comes before us for consideration in dealing with our subject is

THE CHRONOLOGY OF GENESIS,

and the first question to be treated is, "Are the sources of the author's information consistent with one another, or are they not?" The "Higher Critic" says not. It is therefore necessary to examine the passages upon which he relies for the establishment of his position. The passages cited must be taken one by one and examined. This is a tiresome work, but it is the only way in which the assertion can be tested.

1. xii. 11: It is objected that Abram could not have called his wife "a fair woman to look upon" (J) when she was sixty-five years of age (P; deduced from a comparison of xii. 4 with xvii. 17. We scarcely think, though considerable stress is laid upon it in the commentary, that this objection should be taken seriously. If it stood by itself it certainly would be held to be of little avail, and therefore, if we can be considered to have satisfactorily disposed of the other counts in the indictment, the question of the possibility of personal beauty in a woman at a particular age can be safely treated as a negligible quantity.

2. xxi. 15: It is objected in this case that, when we are told that Hagar "cast" Ishmael under a shrub in the desert, the word implies that she was carrying him, and that this was a physical impossibility, as he was at least fifteen years old. To begin with, supposing Hagar was carrying him, it does not follow that she had carried him for any long distance, and it is within the experience of some of us what physical strength women are sometimes endowed with in times of stress. But, further, the word "cast" does not "clearly imply" a carrying of the boy. Joseph's brothers did not carry him to the pit into which they cast him (xxxvii. 24; the Hebrew word is the same). It is just as easy to assume that Hagar supported her fainting boy for some little distance and then made him lie down under a shrub whilst she went a little way off as it is to assume that she was carrying him.

3. xxiv. 67: The objection this time is that it is unnatural to suppose that Isaac would have mourned for his mother for three years. Here again there is nothing but pure assumption. Family affection is throughout the book represented as very strong; and in a later passage, if we are content to take it as it stands, Jacob is represented as sorrowing for Joseph for more than thirteen years (*cf.* xxxvii. 2 with xli. 46) after he had supposed him to be torn in pieces by wild beasts. I cannot find, however, that Dr. Driver objects to this grief as impossible.

4. xxvii.: The inconsistency alleged with regard to this chapter is that in it "Isaac is to all appearance, according to the representation of the narrator (J), upon his death-bed (*cf.* verse 2)," and yet that, according to P, he lived for eighty, or, at any rate, for forty-three, years afterwards. In the one case Isaac would be at this time 100 years old, in the other 137. Now, what does the narrative really say? It depicts to us Isaac as an old man, with sight gone to such an extent that he could not distinguish between his two sons. In his condition, in an age of the world when artificial aids to feeble sight were not available, he is unable to fulfil many of the duties of the head of the family, and his helplessness makes him realize the uncertainty of life. There is not a word about a death-bed. All he wants to make sure of is that before he dies his son shall have his blessing and the privileges of succession secured to him. It is his helplessness more than any idea of immediately impending death that urges him on; and it is this very helplessness of the blind old patriarch which is the reason why we read nothing more of him till we have the account of his death (xxxv. 27-29).

A further difficulty is suggested about the age of Jacob when he fled to Haran, as compared with the date when Esau took his Hittite wives (xxvi. 34). But it has always seemed to me that there is an easy explanation of this, and that is that, by some accident to the MSS., xxvi. 34, 35 (ascribed to P) has been misplaced, and ought to come immediately before xxvii. 46, where the same authority (P) is resorted to again. Jacob would then be only forty (*not* seventy-seven) when he fled to Haran. Nobody, I suppose, would ever contend that such a misplacement was impossible.

5. xxxv. 8: We are told in this verse of the death of Rebekah's nurse, Deborah, and as a nameless nurse is said to have come into Palestine with Rebekah 140 years previously (xxiv. 59), it is assumed that the two persons must be the same, and that therefore there is an inconsistency here between J and E. That Rebekah had but one nurse is a pure assumption. We are not told how long Rebekah lived; and it is

quite possible that Deborah was a much later and younger dependent of Rebekah than the nameless nurse of the earlier passage. Dr. Driver expresses surprise (p. 309) at "the sudden appearance of Rebekah's nurse in Jacob's company." Yet how often may we read in the obituary notices in our newspapers of the deaths of very old nurses or other servants, who have lived on to be the beloved and trusted confidantes of those whose children they had helped to bring up.

6. xxxviii.: Here, again, we are told that there is "a grave chronological discrepancy between P and JE" (p. 365), because of the position of the narrative after the selling of Joseph into Egypt. But although it appears in that particular position, the note of time "at that time" is very indefinite. More than one reasonable explanation of its position might be given. Dr. Driver would allow us to put back the narrative "(say) ten years." Why we may not put it further back still he does not say. But its position here may, at any rate, be due to one of the following reasons: Joseph is to be the leading character of the next chapters. Before, then, his brethren are lost sight of, Judah, who is a very important personage in the source J (*cf.* xlix. 8-12), must have his line of descent carried forward, especially as regal power is attributed to him. And the place for the insertion is suggested by the part Judah plays in the previous chapter (xxxvii. 26). Or it may be that the cause for its insertion in its present position is that the scene of action is shifted to Egypt, and the writer—for the source of the greater part of xxxvii. as well as of xxxviii. is J—is anxious to close the record of Jacob's sons in Palestine.

7. xliv. 20: It is objected as inconsistent that this verse speaks of Benjamin as "a child of" Jacob's "old age, a little one," whereas in xlvi. 21 he is represented as the father of ten sons (whilst in the LXX. he is the father of three sons and seven grandsons). To this it may be answered that the word "child" does not necessarily imply an infant. It is translated—*e.g.*, by R.V. in Gen. iv. 23—"a young man." And, further, "a little one" may just as well mean one that need not be taken into account, "insignificant." The form of the Hebrew word is different in its Massoretic pointing from that translated "youngest," and applied to Benjamin in xlii. 13 (E), and it is noticeable that it is used in this sense of "insignificant" of tribal Benjamin (1 Sam. ix. 21). It would, then, be a word put by Judah into his own and his ten brothers' mouths, as if to draw off (the unrecognised) Joseph's attention from him as one not worth thinking about.

I venture to think that, after all, something still remains to be said for the consistency of the narrative of Genesis with

itself, though it may be derived from different sources. It is tiresome unravelling the threads of the tangle that we are presented with by the critics, which would not very often occur to an ordinary reader; but it is hoped that something has been done towards the solution of some of the difficulties, at any rate.

But another question which is much more widely-reaching remains to be answered: "Is the chronology of Genesis, if, and in so far as, it is consistent with itself, consistent with such external data as we possess for fixing the chronology of the period embraced in the Book?" (p. xxv).

We will take for granted that there are more notes of time in P than in the other sources. There is nothing unreasonable in that. If we compare various histories of the same period together we shall find that dates and chronological tables occupy much more space in one than in another. But is it quite fair to say that in P there is a systematic chronology running through the Book from the beginning almost to the end?

To begin with, it is quite clear that corruption of the numerals, or symbols for the numerals, involved must have set in at a very early date. So confused have they become that, taking the Massoretic text of the Hebrew, the Septuagint version (a translation of a Hebrew text older than the Massoretic text), and the Samaritan version, the figures show a widely-varying reckoning. If they are treated simply as figures to be added together, and from them a "systematic chronology" is to be evolved, we have to make our choice as to the length of time from the Creation of Man to the Call of Abraham between 2,021, 2,322 and 3,407 years respectively. It will be observed that the last of these is nearly one and three-quarter times as long again as the first.

The fact is that there is no "systematic chronology" at all for these early periods. It is nowhere said: So many years elapsed from the Creation of Man to the Flood; or, So many years elapsed from the Flood to the Call of Abraham.

No! what we have got are two *systematized genealogical tables* (Gen. v.; xi. 10-26), if you like to call them by that name.

Let me put the information which they give us in another form:

So all the generations from Adam unto Noah are ten generations; and from Noah unto the removal to Canaan are ten generations.

It will at once, I think, be obvious why I have put my statement in this form. There is a Book of Genesis (*βίβλος γενέσεως*) at the opening of the New Testament. That part

of our Bible begins with a genealogical table, and the summing up of it is expressed as follows:

So all the generations from Abraham unto David are fourteen generations; and from David unto the carrying away (R.V. marg. "removal") *to Babylon fourteen generations; and from the carrying away to Babylon unto the Christ fourteen generations* (St. Matt. i. 17).

Now, no one contends that this latter statement is exhaustive of all the generations. The author of the table of descent condensed it to secure the three twice sevens and make up thus his three sets of fourteen generations. This is universally acknowledged, and no one has ever ventured to question the historicity of St. Matthew's Gospel—at any rate, in its broadest outlines—because of the statement of the verse I have quoted, and that notwithstanding that there is not the shadow of an indication, so far as the book itself is concerned, that there is any such omission.

Such a harping, as it were, upon numbers finds its place also in the Old Testament. In these two tables we have symmetry introduced by the occurrence of the number "ten" in both. We can find, moreover, at least one hint that the incomplete character of the genealogies was recognised. In the Septuagint version of Gen. xi. we find an extra name inserted—Kainan—between Arpachshad and Shelah, with the two statements of years lived before and after he begat a son; and this additional name duly appears in St. Luke's genealogy of our Lord.

If this view be once accepted, then the whole theory that the chronology of Genesis is inconsistent with extra-Biblical chronology, and is a strong argument for the non-historicity of the book, topples over—at any rate, so far as the pre-Abrahamitic times are concerned. The tables are intended, in a condensed form, to lead us down the path of the world's history to the time of the selection of the individual from whom was to spring the elect people of God. The difficulty about the development of tribes and cities between the Babel incident and the times of Abraham will disappear; the date of the Flood will fall in much more exactly with the Babylonian tablets; and the ten patriarchs will be parallel to the ten mythic antediluvian heroes with immensely long lives of the ante-Xisuthros, and therefore antediluvian, times.

There remain, of course, two great difficulties connected with these two genealogical statements: (1) The fact that each of the patriarchs' lives is divided into sections. But with regard to this we are in no worse position than any other school of critics, for all alike have to allow that "it is an artificial system, which must have been arrived at in some

way by computation, though the data upon which it was calculated have not at present been ascertained" (p. xxx). (2) The length of life ascribed to the antediluvian patriarchs. This question is inextricably mixed up with the previous one, and our ignorance of the mode of computation adopted by the author or compiler of the source called P. The possibility of such a length for human life is a subject to be discussed under some different heading from the present one. It may be that the great number of years of life ascribed in the first table to the antediluvian patriarchs is a faint reflection of the tradition that an innumerable number of centuries had passed over the world before the cataclysm described in Gen. vi.-ix.

If this view of the genealogical statements be accepted, we are not only not precluded from placing the Flood much earlier in the world's history than the date which a simple addition of the years of the postdiluvian patriarchs from Noah to Abraham would give us, but it would also give a longer period for development and for arriving at such a state of things as we find in Abraham's time.

With regard to the rest of the book, we can only deduce one period, that from the call of Abraham to the going down of Jacob into Egypt, which is generally accepted as amounting to 215 years. The next difficulty is, of course, the length of the sojourn in Egypt; but that question does not fall within our present subject, depending as it does entirely upon passages outside the Book of Genesis (Exod. i. 11; xii. 40, 41; 1 Kings vi. 1), the only allusion to it in this book being the mention in a prophecy (xv. 13) of a period of 400 years of affliction in a strange land, and of a return in the fourth generation.

The fact is that there is demanded of the author of Genesis or the authors of the sources from which that book is derived a systematic chronology which would have been quite out of keeping with the times about which he or they wrote. Numbers do not seem to have been accurately dealt with by the copyists of Hebrew manuscripts. Letters took the place of figures, and one letter was easily confused with another. Universally admitted cases of this are to be found in other periods of Jewish history (*e.g.*, see 1 Sam. xiii., and *cf.* 2 Kings viii. 26 with 2 Chron. xxii. 2). If this be so in documents which have to do with history of a much later date, it is surely not too much to ask that we should not be nailed down to accepting two statements which do not agree, as if there were no room for a mistake to have crept in.

An attempt is being made in these articles to meet the statements of the "Higher Critics" on their own ground. J

have, therefore, accepted, for argumentative purposes, the generally accepted division of Genesis amongst its sources, though I do not accept the dates to which they are assigned, and I have not attempted to make any independent analysis of the book. H. A. REDPATH.

(To be continued.)

ART. IV.—BIBLE REASONS FOR CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT.

THE division of the Liberal Party on the question of Home Rule for Ireland removed the Disestablishment of the Church of England from the sphere of immediate politics; the Liberal Unionists considering the continued Establishment of the English Church far less objectionable than Irish Home Rule. But Tariff Reform has now so strangely broken up the whole Unionist party, Conservative and Liberal alike, that the next General Election may again bring Disestablishment to the front, while the unhappy disputes about the schools will have had an unfavourable influence over those of our fellow-citizens who see no scriptural grounds for Church Establishment. I believe there are such grounds, and I write this present paper because I have arrived at conclusions on this subject which are not generally apprehended, but which, if they are true, are of supreme importance, and which appear to me to be such as no one who takes the New Testament as authoritative can intelligently deny.

That the Disestablishment of the Church of England was one main object of at least the Radical section of the Liberal party as early as 1885 is plainly shown in "The Radical Programme," published in that year. Besides one whole article on Disestablishment out of the eleven which the book contains, the subject is dealt with at considerable length in another article, and the strong dislike of the writers to the clergy shows itself in more than one of the others. I do not altogether wonder at that dislike, for while everything else has changed in England, the clergy are trying to grapple with the complicated problems of these days under an ecclesiastical constitution substantially the same as that of the Middle Ages. Still, as I shall show, the unsatisfactory position of the clergy, and with them of the Church, is no sufficient ground for Disestablishment. We have not disestablished the State, but reformed it. Both Church and State are divine institutions. The relation between them, called Establishment, is also