

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

MARCH, 1900.

ART. I.—THE WITNESS OF THE HISTORICAL SCRIPTURES TO THE ACCURACY OF THE PENTATEUCH.

No. IV.

WE come now to Joshua vi. This, save vers. 2 and 27, is assigned by Professor Driver to JE. The two verses just mentioned, however, are stated to display the tendencies of the Deuteronomic reviser. One may be allowed to doubt whether any critic, or combination of critics, can show such preternatural acuteness as is involved in criticism so minute as this. As I have frequently said before, one would very much like to see it employed in some case where it was possible to test it. But preternaturally acute as the critics are, they have managed to overlook some very definite traces of P in the narrative assigned to JE. In other words (for this constant acceptance as a basis for argument of assumptions which we do not grant for a moment, must be a little confusing to the ordinary reader) there are *clear signs of a common authorship of the Pentateuch here*—strong reasons for believing that the Pentateuch in its complete form was before the author of this chapter when he wrote. For, whereas Professor Driver assigns this chapter mainly to JE, it contains proofs that the Pentateuch *as a whole* must have been in existence when it was written, and therefore, if Professor Driver's view of the composition of that chapter be true, in "the eighth or ninth century B.C." For, first of all, the priests were to bear and blow the trumpets (ver. 4). Now, the "ordinance for ever" that the blowing of the trumpets was to be the duty of the priests is first given in *the supposed post-exilic writer P* (Num. x. 8; cf. xxxi. 6). Nor is this all. The trumpets were "trumpets of Jubilee," a phrase

entirely characteristic of P, or rather H, the "Law of Holiness," as Klostermann has designated Lev. xvii.-xxvi., because of a "foreign element"¹ contained in these chapters. There is a wise reserve, it is true, about the date assigned to what Wellhausen calls this "peculiar collection" of laws. But at least they are not generally supposed by Wellhausen and his school to be anterior to the "eighth or ninth century B.C.," the time, observe, when, as Professor Driver tells us, what he calls JE was compiled. But these trumpets clearly obtain their name from the great festival with which their use was primarily connected. And this use, we may observe, was well known to the author of Joshua vi., and described by him as already recognised at the siege of Jericho. Do the German school wish us to understand that the appointment of the priests to blow with the trumpet, and the regulations of the year of Jubilee, were already established in the "eighth or ninth century B.C."? What, in that case, becomes of the theory that the priesthood was "among the last to reach a settled state"²? We say nothing about the ark, for our English critics at least do not, like their German colleagues, attempt to represent the story of the ark as unhistoric. But the ark, the priests, and their trumpets are clearly marked in this narrative, although it is assigned by the critics to JE. Why, then, do they assign the regulations to which this narrative bears testimony to a post-exilic writer?

Our next point will be the law of the *חרם* or thing devoted.³ This occurs in Deuteronomy and in P, but *never in JE*. Yet here we find it not only thoroughly accepted in what we are told is JE, but described as having been acted upon at the siege of Jericho. On what grounds does this fabrication on JE's part—for a fabrication it must be if it be not authentic history—rest? It is not a priestly fabrication, for JE, by hypothesis, is not a priestly document. How did this custom arise, and what information have we of the custom of devoting things under prophetic, as distinguished from priestly, influence?⁴ The whole story of Achan, moreover, must be rejected as unhistorical, unless the *חרם* were a custom thoroughly well known to Joshua. Then, the technical term for that which was not destroyed

¹ Driver, "Introduction," p. 44. It, however, is generally supposed to be as much post-exilic as P. The phrase "trumpets of Jubilee" is therefore *ex hypothesi* post-exilic.

² *Ibid.*, p. 146.

³ The word *חרם* appears once in JE, in the sense of "utterly destroy."

⁴ It may be necessary to explain that I do not deal with the question of the historical credibility of the narrative. My point is simply that the author is acquainted with the custom of the *חרם*, though it is declared to have been unknown in his day.

under the **קֹדֶשׁ** was *Holiness to Jehovah* (Josh. vi. 19). But this (see Exod. xxviii. 36, xxxix. 30) we read of for the first time in the Priestly Code, so far as it relates to Hebrew ritual. The words were ordered to be inscribed on the gold plate affixed to the high-priest's mitre. Did the author of the Priestly Code borrow these words from JE's account of the siege of Jericho? Is it not far more reasonable to suppose that the narrative here presupposes P, which could not, therefore, have been written at least five centuries afterwards, and that Joshua desired to make the gold, silver, and brass of Jericho as sacred in the people's eyes as the high-priest's garments were already known to be? Nor does the statement in chap. v. 25, that Rahab's descendants were in Israel at the date of the composition of the book, admit of any other explanation than that the fact, though an extremely surprising one, was yet one well known to the writer. It was a fact of a character not in the least likely to be invented, and if not, then the narrative bears a stamp of verisimilitude not very easy to be effaced. For *David was descended from Rahab*, and therefore the fact was one on which there could be no mistake. Nor was such a statement likely to have been first made in times long subsequent to David. Thus we have here no vague traditions, handed down no one knows how, but history carefully written, and based on genealogies carefully preserved—just what, in fact, we should expect in the records of a civilized country, though not, of course, in the vague reminiscences of an unlettered horde. The argument, too, derived from the silence of the historian as to any fulfilment of Joshua's curse on the rebuilder of Jericho has been ignored or scorned, but has not been answered. The obvious explanation—and it does not seem possible to explain the fact in any other way—was that the prophecy was not fulfilled when the Book of Joshua was published, but was fulfilled *circa* 900 B.C., and its fulfilment carefully noted at the time. The natural inference is that the Book of Joshua, or at least this portion of it, had already been composed and published before the commencement of "the ninth century B.C."¹

The story of Achan and of the taking of Ai do not afford much evidence of date. They are chiefly assigned to JE, but there are "short additions and expansions" in which "the

¹ The solitary use of **קֶרֶן** in ver. 5 for a musical instrument seems to suggest an early date for this narrative, while the fact that **מִאֲחֵר** is only used in the sense of *rearward* in Num. x. 25 (P) and Isa. lii. 12, here seems to indicate (1) that the writer of this passage was acquainted with the Pentateuch in its present form, and (2) that the passage is of an early date. Another word supplanted **מִאֲחֵר** in the later literature, save in poetry.

hand of D₂ may be detected, such as, 'Fear not, neither be dismayed.'¹ Why? Simply because the theory requires that the story, as we here have it, should have passed through the hands of a Deuteronomic reviser. Why the Deuteronomic reviser should have taken the trouble to add his characteristic phrases to a narrative already, one would suppose, made graphic enough by the compiler of JE is not immediately apparent. All that can be said is that he *might* have done so. But it is equally possible that he did not. That he *did* do so, even on the hypothesis that there *was* a Deuteronomic revision, is not only not proved, but cannot be proved. Moreover, the whole story involves the existence of a people under a special Divine guidance. The idea of the impossibility of success without the approval of Jehovah is common to this chapter and to Num. xiv. The "sanctifying the people" looks back to Exod. xix. 10. And though these portions have been carefully assigned to JE, we can of course have no certainty that they have any other author than the rest of the Pentateuch. But if the postulate of a people under a Divine supernatural guidance is assumed in the history, is it in the least degree likely that the lawgiver whose successor Joshua was had given no directions to the people thus supernaturally guided, either as regards their relations to God or man? The use of the lot, resorted to here and in 1 Sam. xiv. 38, 39 quite as a matter of course, is explained by its use as an indication of the Divine will in Lev. xvi. 8-10, Num. xxvi. 55, xxxiii. 24, xxxiv. 13, xxxvi. 2. All these passages are said to belong to P. Is it possible, then, that P can have been written during or after the Exile? The provisions in Deut. xiii. 16, xxi. 23, about not allowing bodies to remain hanging all night, are carefully observed here, as in chap. x. 27. And if we are told that these are Deuteronomic insertions, we are entitled to ask why the Deuteronomist took such pains to insert these allusions to precepts of entirely secondary importance, while he neglected to introduce any similar allusions to matters which he regarded as of primary consequence, such as the necessity of the worship at the one sanctuary? Moreover, the whole tone of the history reflects that of the Pentateuch as a whole. It emphasizes the strictness and awfulness of the Divine law, the sternness and severity of the punishment of those who disobeyed it. The fact, which is not denied, that in the "eighth or ninth century B.C." there was already a law in Israel that every "soul that doeth aught presumptuously" shall be "utterly cut off," and that "because he hath despised the word of

¹ Driver, "Introduction," p. 99.

Jehovah and hath broken His commandment,"¹ is sufficient to show that there were already very definite "statutes, commandments, and judgments" in Israel—something rather more than a "certain germ" of ceremonial and moral enactment—otherwise such tremendous penalties could hardly be enjoined for disobedience. It does not look much as if at that time Israel were just emerging, or had just emerged, from polytheism into the worship of Jehovah.

Chapter ix. is supposed to be the work of JE and D₂ save vers. 15*b*, 17-21. "The narrative in 22, 23-26*f* form evidently a narrative *parallel* to that of vers. 17-21, and not the sequel of it, and the style of the latter shows that it belongs to P (notice especially 'the congregation' and 'the princes' who here take the lead rather than Joshua)."² In other words, when the redactor had two plain tales before him, either of which he might have followed, he chose to puzzle his readers by putting them side by side, without any attempt at reconciliation. Have we in reality anything here but the repetition so common in what have hitherto been, and may still reasonably be, regarded as the earliest portions of the Scriptures—a repetition employed for the purpose of giving emphasis, fulness, and picturesqueness to the narrative? It is perhaps a little surprising that the critics have not told us that the "princes and the congregation" were brought into the narrative by P in order to save the credit of Joshua. The truth appears to be that Joshua acted *with* the princes and the congregation, and that they all, as men are often tempted to do now, acted on their own judgment, instead of seeking Divine guidance. It is most improbable that we have here anything but that honest adherence to fact and that high religious tone which marks the whole of the Old and New Testament Scriptures. This adherence to truth compels them to point out the errors and failings, even of the best of men. Such honesty is characteristic alike of JE and P,³ and is altogether incompatible with the idea of a mythical semi-apotheosis, in the course of ages, of ancient heroes whose real deeds are lost in the mists of antiquity. The expression "hewers of wood and drawers of water" is supposed to be characteristic of P. But why should P have gone out of his way to attribute this function to the Gibeonites when, as is well known, they had long since ceased to fulfil it? One other remark may be made before we quit this subject. Ver. 15*b* is supposed to belong to P. But ver. 14*b* is assigned to JE. Yet it refers to

¹ Num. xv. 30, 31. This passage is attributed to JE.

² "Introduction," p. 100.

³ *E.g.*, in Num. xx., supposed to be compounded of all three narratives.

Num. xxvii. 21, in which we first read of the reference to God by Urim and Thummim. See also Exod. xxviii. 30, Lev. viii. 8. All these passages are assigned to P, though P was not in existence when JE was compiled. The practice is further mentioned quite incidentally in Deut. xxxiii. 8, which "was probably handed down independently, and inserted here when DT as a whole was incorporated in the Pent."¹ How did the reference to a custom not known to the Deuteronomist get into JE? Here, it is to be presumed, we have another specimen of "pre-existing Temple usage."

Nor is this all which deserves notice in this chapter. It is a special and particular doctrine of the critics that it is P who emphasizes the doctrine of the One Sanctuary, introduced as a binding ordinance in the first instance by D. Deuteronomy, Professor Driver tells us, must have followed JE "at a considerable interval."² He appears (but it must be confessed he here expresses himself with considerable vagueness³) to adduce the "unambiguous and strict" law of sacrifice as a proof of this. Deuteronomy lays down the rule that such sacrifice must "only" be offered at some central sanctuary; though not JE, but the earlier "Book of the Covenant" (Exod. xx. 24), is cited for a law less "unambiguous and strict." Still, it would seem that in JE the law of the Central Sanctuary had not as yet been defined. To define it finally, and to emphasize it unmistakably, was the province of P. But in Josh. ix. 17-21 it is P (to whom this passage is assigned by Professor Driver) who brings the princes and the congregation into prominence, and makes the Gibeonites hewers of wood and drawers of water unto *them*, while it is JE (to whom ver. 23 is assigned) who declares that they are to be hewers of wood and drawers of water to the "house of my God." Here, then, we have a strange inversion in the functions of these two writers, and of their radical religious conceptions. It is remarkable that we hear no more of this service of the Gibeonites at the temple. In 1 Chron. ix. 2, Ezek. ii. 43 and viii. 20 we read of the Nethinim instead, and in the last cited passage we are told that David and the princes appointed these "for the service of the Levites," *i.e.*, it would seem almost certain for the service once rendered by the Gibeonites. What was the *cause* of this change? Obviously the *slaughter of the Gibeonites by Saul*, recorded in 2 Sam. xxi. 1. They were not all slain, but no doubt there was a considerable massacre, perhaps at the same time with

¹ "Introduction," p. 90.

² "Introduction," p. 80.

³ Yet in p. 131 he seems to commit himself to this proposition when he speaks of the "relative freedom" with which JE treats "the place of sacrifice."

the slaughter of the priests at Nob (1 Sam. xxi.), especially as we are told that Saul committed this cruel act from his "zeal for the children of Israel and Judah." A few Gibeonites evidently escaped, but not enough for the gradually increasing requirements of the Tabernacle service. We are not told the probable date of the "miscellaneous appendix" in 2 Sam. xxi. But the two Books of Samuel are generally supposed, even by the critics, to be in the main trustworthy history. It is singular, to say the least, that they should thus incidentally confirm the story of P if P were published at so late a date as is supposed. This is another of the problems which criticism leaves unexplained.

In chap. x. there is not much that bears on our subject. There is once more (ver. 27) an allusion to the Deuteronomic command not to allow dead bodies to remain hanging all night. Of these prohibitions all that need be said is that if they were introduced for the purpose of supporting the authority of Deuteronomy, they are singularly few and oddly chosen. As to the history of the sun standing still, it is obviously a later insertion. Not only is it declared in the text to be a quotation from a book which has not come down to us, but the marks of quotation are quite clear. The scribe who inserted the quotation has not only interrupted the course of the narrative, but has made his reflections on the quotation, and has inserted ver. 43 in the wrong place. It is instructive to see how, when the critics are confronted with a real insertion of a passage from a later work, they deal with it. "Vers. 12*b*, 13*a* (to 'enemies') is an extract from an ancient collection of national songs, called the 'Book of Jashar,' or 'Of the Upright'; vers. 13*b*, 14*a* is the comment of the narrator (here, perhaps, E) upon it." Ver. 14*b* is given to D₂. The supposition that the Deuteronomist has here striven to magnify Joshua's success will be discussed under Judges i. But there can be no doubt that the history as it stands, without the quotation from the book of Jashar, is probable enough. Similar successes have frequently been achieved. Joshua's celerity, which marks him out as one of the great commanders of the world, as well as the disorganization which alarm and defeat had created among his antagonists, are sufficient to account for the events recorded in the latter part of this chapter. Nor does the historian himself fail to point these causes out.¹

Chap. xi. is said to be from JE and D. But we may remark that ver. 21, taken in connection with the incidental mention of the Anakim in Num. xiii. and Deut. i. 28, looks as little like a vague tradition of the "eighth or ninth century B.C."

¹ Chap. ii. 9; v. 1; x. 2.

as anything can well do. Nor does the corroboration of this passage in chap. xv. 14 make it any more like such a tradition, the more especially when the redactor has tacked the passage on to a chance archæological mention (by P, we are asked to believe) of Hebron as "the city of Arba, the father of Anak." Verily Jewish history must have been extraordinarily concocted. Why these minute archæological details from the pen of the post-exilic author? It is remarkable, moreover, that we only find the "divisions of the tribes" mentioned by "D₂" in ver. 23, in Num. xxvi. assigned to P.

Chap. xii. is a "generalizing review by D₂." If so, it is singular that the language of ver. 7 is *peculiar to the Pentateuch and Joshua*, while as to ver. 6, it re-echoes the language of Num. xxxii. 22, 29, which, though identical in the two verses, is assigned to JE in ver. 22 and to P in ver. 29. There would seem to be no sufficient reason why these two almost identical passages should be assigned to separate authors. Identity of phrase is usually supposed by the critics to involve identity of authorship. But the modern criticism has no fixed rules. They seem to be made, as a physician would say, *pro re nata*.

In chap. xiii. 3 (the earlier part of which is assigned to D₂) we have a note of accuracy somewhat remarkable in a loose and not over-trustworthy tradition, handed down by word of mouth for three or four centuries at least. By the "eighth and ninth century, B.C.," if we are to trust the history, the Philistines had long had kings. They had had kings, too, in the days of Abraham and Isaac. But here we have the expression, "the five lords (סרני) of the Philistines," indicating with accuracy the time when they were governed, not by kings, but by chieftains. This is not a little significant in regard to the date of the narrative. Ver. 21 is assigned to P. But it may be observed that it combines the history contained in Num. xxii.-xxv. (JE) with the words of xxxi. 8 (P) in just the way a later author would cite an earlier homogeneous narrative. Then we have twice, in ver. 14 and in ver. 33 (assigned to D₂), a distinct announcement of the fact that to the tribe of Levi no inheritance is given. Our friends the critics are very fond of the argument *e silentio* when it suits them. We may be permitted to inquire how it suits them here. There is *not a single allusion* throughout the whole Old Testament to Levi as having ever occupied a position similar to the other tribes. Professor Driver is strangely reticent about the probable date of the song of Deborah. But the analogy of other countries¹ would lead any ordinary historical

¹ See my "Commentary on Judges," p. 32. Mr. Rider Haggard gives us exactly similar lyric effusions from among the South African tribes commemorating recent encounters.

critic to the conclusion that it was a lyrical poem composed on the occasion of the victory, like the *piesmas* of the Montenegrins or the pieces of early poetry inserted in the Saxon Chronicle. It may be remarked that while ten of the tribes are mentioned in that poem, Judah, Simeon and Levi are not mentioned. The abstention of the two former of these may be explained by their geographical position or by some other local circumstances which have not come down to us. At all events, it does not seem to have drawn forth the indignation of the songstress. And it is in keeping with the whole contents of the Book of Judges, in which Judah, after chapter i., plays a most singularly insignificant part. The abstention of Levi falls in with the statement here, which has all the appearance of having come from a person well informed on the subjects on which he is writing, that the tribe of Levi had no definite inheritance assigned to it, in consequence of its duties in connection with the sanctuary. The silence of the whole history of Israel concerning the tribe of Levi as performing any other functions confirms this view. The fact of the selection of that particular tribe is thus undesignedly corroborated by the history as it has come down to us. It did not depend on any particular sanctity attached to that tribe from the beginning. That is clearly incompatible with Jacob's song, which, we may remark, would hardly have been handed down by the priestly faction if they had, as is supposed, largely falsified or, if the phrase pleases the critics better, "gone over" the history in the interests of the priestly party. The selection was owing to the fact that Levi was the tribe to which the founder of Israelite institutions, as well as the first high priest, happened to belong.

The remainder of Joshua may be more briefly passed over. The writer of these pages may be permitted to remark that, while following the account of the division of the tribes with the excellent map of the Palestine Exploration Society, he was struck with the extraordinarily minute topographical accuracy of the details given in Joshua of the borders of the various tribes where they admitted of being verified. Wherever we are told of the deflection of a border line, the fact is in exact accordance with the results obtained in the survey. Whence came this accuracy? Will any reader of the Book of Nehemiah, unless that, too, be altogether unhistorical, contend that in the then political condition of Palestine it was possible to carry out a survey so thorough as is involved in the chapters we are considering; or that, even supposing it were possible, it was in the least likely that any Jew of that age would have undertaken it? Even in the "eighth or ninth century B.C." such a survey, bearing in mind the not too cordial relations between the Southern and Northern king-

doms, might possibly have presented some difficulties to the surveyor analogous, perhaps, to those which would have beset Mr. Cecil Rhodes had he, between the period of the Jameson Raid and that of the declaration of war between the Boers and this country, undertaken a careful topographical survey of the Transvaal. The only rational inference is that this part of Joshua is ancient and authentic. Yet Professor Driver, following his authorities, completes *his* survey of the topographical portion of the Book of Joshua, assigning passages at will to "JE" and "P," without having directed us to any sources from which these writers could possibly have obtained their remarkably accurate information. Can this sort of *ex cathedrâ* utterance, without explanation or argument, be dignified with the name of scientific criticism?

J. J. LIAS.

(*To be continued.*)



ART. II.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY SINCE THE RESTORATION.

JOHN TILLOTSON.

“**V**ICTRIX causa diis placuit, sed victa Catoni.” Though this could never be Sancroft’s motto—for till the last hour of his life he prayed God that the cause for which he was a confessor would yet be triumphant—it is the verdict which history has passed upon the Revolution of 1688. That event was almost as important an epoch in English political history as was the Reformation in ecclesiastical. It was the final rejection by the nation of the Tudor and Stuart theory of government—that of an irresponsible monarchy. Both politicians and ecclesiastics had still much to learn, of course; new ideas, however sound and good, always run into excesses and mistakes, but it is the part of our faith to look to the good hand of the living God to correct these, and still to lead us on.

Tillotson was probably as good a representative as could have been found of the new doctrine of government. There is deep pathos in the story of the fall of the Stuarts, even in the eyes of those who believed that it was a necessity. The nation had never lost the sense of penitence for the death of Charles I.; the nobleness of his devotion to the Church was tardily recognised, and the cause for which he died, and the beauty of the English Liturgy, had never been more appreciated than now. And thus it was that, though the people were resolute to defend their faith, they were tender to the king who sought to supplant it, and bent on preserving, as far as was compatible with national rights, the hereditary succession. And