

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 *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute,

OR,

Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LV.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1923.

649TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W. 1, ON MONDAY, JANUARY 29TH, 1923,

AT 4.30 P.M.

LIEUT.-COLONEL F. A. MOLONY, O.B.E., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the following Elections were announced. As Members: Benjamin I. Greenwood, Esq., the Rev. James M. Pollock, M.A., Major Arthur F. Smith, D.S.O., M.C., Coldstream Guards, W. G. H. Cook, Esq., LL.D., M.Sc., Barr., and Leonard W. Kern, Esq. As Associates: The Rev. H. H. Skinner, M.A., C. E. Welldon, Esq., and S. Hay Wrightson, Esq.

The CHAIRMAN explained the circumstances of the recent death of the author of the paper, the Rev. Andrew Craig Robinson, M.A.

The paper, which was entitled "Three Peculiarities of the Pentateuch which show that the Higher Critical Theories of its late Composition cannot be reasonably held," was then read by the Honorary Secretary.

*THREE PECULIARITIES OF THE PENTATEUCH
WHICH SHOW THAT THE HIGHER CRITICAL
THEORIES OF ITS LATE COMPOSITION CANNOT
BE REASONABLY HELD.* By the REV. ANDREW CRAIG
ROBINSON, M.A.

- (1) THE ABSENCE OF THE NAME "JERUSALEM" FROM THE PENTATEUCH.
- (2) THE ABSENCE OF ANY MENTION OF SACRED SONG FROM THE RITUAL OF THE PENTATEUCH.
- (3) THE ABSENCE OF THE DIVINE TITLE "LORD OF HOSTS" FROM THE PENTATEUCH.

-
- (1) THE ABSENCE OF THE NAME "JERUSALEM" FROM THE PENTATEUCH.

JERUSALEM! What a world of sacred and pathetic history gathers round the word! Jerusalem which Jehovah chose out of all the tribes of Israel to put His Name in for ever. One feels as if the entire history of the people of Israel was

inseparably linked with that sacred Name. Yet, if we examine the Old Testament, we shall find that the name "Jerusalem" never occurs in *The Pentateuch*. In one unique chapter of Genesis—the fourteenth—the city is called "Salem," which seems to be an echo of the cuneiform name Uru-salem, and some archæologists of note are of opinion, that this whole chapter in all probability was once an ancient cuneiform record. Except in this chapter, however, no name in the Pentateuch for Jerusalem ever occurs. The first occurrence of the name in the Old Testament is found in Joshua x, 1, "Now it came to pass, when Adoni-zedec king of Jerusalem had heard how Joshua had taken Ai, and had utterly destroyed it; as he had done to Jericho and her king, so had he done to Ai and her king." The name Jerusalem afterwards occurs seven other times in the Book of Joshua. Now to those who hold the "conservative" view of the Pentateuch, the non-occurrence of the name Jerusalem is nothing unaccountable. The reason why shrines like Shechem, Hebron, Beersheba and Bethel are mentioned in Genesis with such distinguished honour is simply, no doubt, because they really were sacred places of venerable antiquity, consecrated, perhaps, by reason of the patriarchs having sojourned there and erected their altars for sacrifice and worship. And, on the other hand, the reason that the name Jerusalem does not occur in the Book of Genesis, except in the form "Salem" in one especial passage, would simply seem to be because, even though Jerusalem may have been of old a sacred place, it was not one near which the patriarchs had ever chanced to pitch their tents or build their altars to the Lord. But on the assumptions of the Critics of the present day, as to the motives and colouring which are to be detected in the various writers whom they suppose to have had a hand in the composition of Genesis, and the perfectly free hand which they are supposed to have had, the non-occurrence of the name "Jerusalem" would seem to constitute a strange anomaly.

The "Yahvist" or "Jehovist," for example, supposed by the Critics to have written from the point of view and with the bias of a native of the Southern Kingdom—having behind and around him all the sacred and historic glories of Jerusalem—lauds the shrine of Bethel in the Northern Kingdom, whilst he had not one word to say about his own Jerusalem. Between Bethel and Ai is the altar which, according to him, appears to be most dear to Abram; and he makes Jacob say, "Surely the Lord is in

this place; and I knew it not. . . . And he called the name of that place Beth-el" (Gen. xxviii, 16, 19).

And what is still more singular, the "Priestly Writer," "P,"—said to have written in Exilic times—to whom, according to the Critics, such shrines as Bethel ought to be anathema, is actually found consecrating Bethel by a very notable theophany, in a passage which is attributed by Kuenen to "P2" (*Hex.*, p. 185): "And God went up from him in the place where He spake with him. . . . And Jacob called the name of the place where God spake with him Beth-el" (Gen. xxxv, 13, 15). And whilst he thus glorified Bethel, this Priestly Writer—to whom Jerusalem with her priesthood is supposed to have been the ideal shrine—strange to say, never once, in all his writings in the Pentateuch, even names Jerusalem! "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem," wails the plaintive Exile psalm, "let my right hand forget her cunning."

Was Jerusalem then forgotten in Exilic days, with all her sacred and pathetic story? If not, how strange that she is never named.

Still more remarkable, however, is the non-occurrence of the name "Jerusalem" in the Book of Deuteronomy, because, according to the Critics, the Book of Deuteronomy was found—some say composed—in the reign of Josiah, for the purpose of being used to stamp Jerusalem as the one and only sanctuary of the nation. Now, in the Book of Deuteronomy, the central sanctuary is referred to under three forms of words—the simplest is, "the place which the Lord thy God shall choose." This form occurs in Deut. xii, 18, 27, and nine other passages—xiv, 25; xv, 29; xvi, 7, 15, 16; xvii, 8, 10; xviii, 6; xxxi, 11. A fuller form is, "the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to put His Name there," or to "cause His Name to dwell there" (Deut. xii, 5, 11, 21, and six other passages; xiv, 23, 24; xvi, 2, 6, 11; xxvi, 2). And the third form, which occurs only in two places, slightly varied, is, "But in the place which the Lord shall choose in one of your tribes" (Deut. xii, 14); or "the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put His Name there" (Deut. xii, 5).

By referring to the passages mentioned it will be seen that, not only is Jerusalem not named, but there is not even any intimation given that the central sanctuary is to be in a great city, nor any intimation as to which of the Tribes should be honoured by possessing that sanctuary within its borders. To

those who hold the "conservative" view, however, that the Book of Deuteronomy was composed in the Mosaic Age, the non-occurrence of the name Jerusalem is only natural. When, for example, God commanded that the Passover should be sacrificed "in the place that the Lord shall choose to place His Name there" (Deut. xvi, 2). It was inevitable that the command, although in the ultimate issue it was destined to apply to Jerusalem, should, before the people entered the Promised Land, be simply delivered in this nameless way. Because before it was to mean Jerusalem it was to apply to at least one other shrine of Jehovah's earlier choice, that is to say, to Shiloh, "where I set My Name at the first," Jer. vii, 12, and only in the end to mean Jerusalem.

But from the view of the Critics who hold that the Book of Deuteronomy was composed not long before Josiah's days, and was brought forth, if not concocted, to stamp Jerusalem as the central sanctuary ordained of old, the omission of the name of the place which they wished to hallow, the omission of any intimation that the central sanctuary was in the end to be in a great city, the failure to give any intimation as to which of the tribal territories should be sanctified by its presence, would be strange indeed. If the Book of Deuteronomy were composed, or found, or produced, with the definite purpose of establishing Jerusalem as the central and only sanctuary of the nation, is it reasonable to suppose that those who produced it for such a purpose would have shrunk from naming this great sanctuary, or at least indicating where it was to be? Without some local indication as to where the sanctuary was to be, the Book would hardly help Jerusalem—for "the place which the Lord thy God shall choose" if left un-named might just as well mean Bethel. It would seem as if Wellhausen was exercised by this strange reticence. He writes:—

"How modest, one might almost say how awkwardly bashful, is the Deuteronomic reference to the place which Jehovah is to choose."—*Prolegomena*, p. 37.

"Awkwardly bashful" indeed, if Deuteronomy was written in the days of the Kingdom in the midst of the sacred and historic traditions of Jerusalem, and with the design of setting up Jerusalem, for the first time, as the sole and central sanctuary of the nation. The so-called "Deuteronomic compiler of Kings," however, whom the Critics suppose to have also written at a

time when the glories of Jerusalem lay behind him, is by no means "awkwardly bashful" about naming Jerusalem. He writes:—

I Kings, xi, 32—"for Jerusalem's sake the city which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel." II Kings, xxiii, 27—"Jerusalem which I have chosen and the house of which I said my name shall be there"; xii, 7—"in Jerusalem, which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel will I put My Name for ever."

What is the explanation of all this? What is the inner meaning of this absence of the name of Jerusalem from the Pentateuch? Is it not this: That *at the time the Pentateuch was written, Jerusalem, with all her sacred glories, had not entered yet into the life of Israel?*

(2) THE ABSENCE OF ANY MENTION OF SACRED SONG FROM THE RITUAL OF THE PENTATEUCH.

The complete absence of any mention of musical service in connection with the Mosaic Ritual in the Pentateuch forms a striking contrast to the constantly recurring reference to sacred song in connection with the services of the Second Temple in such books as Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, written in post-Exilic times. To those who hold the "conservative" view of the Pentateuch, however, this circumstance does not constitute any anomaly, because these post-Exilic Books appear to indicate clearly that it was only in the reign of David and by King David himself (from their point of view), that the musical services of the sanctuary were first organized. The absence, accordingly, of any mention of sacred song in connection with the Mosaic Code is only what might naturally be expected.

But the theory of the Criticism of the present day is that the Mosaic Ritual of the "Priestly Code" contained in the Pentateuch was drawn up by priests during and after the Exile, and was intended to regulate the ceremonial of the Second Temple. Now, since that ceremonial, as a matter of fact, embraced so much of musical service, the absence of any mention of sacred song from the "Priestly Code" seems to constitute a curious anomaly. It appears strange that the priests, who are supposed by the Critics to have composed that code, should not, by some mention of sacred song and Levite singers in the Pentateuch, have claimed for the services of music in the Second

Temple the high prestige and sanction of the name of Moses. The composition of the "Priestly Code" is held by the Critics to have been of such an artificial character that the priests in a matter of this kind would have had a perfectly free hand. No such mention, however, in point of fact occurs, and the Pentateuch stands in its primitive simplicity, destitute of any ordinance of music in connection with the ritual, except those passages in which the blowing of trumpets is enjoined at the Feast of Trumpets, the blowing of the trumpet throughout the land in the year of Jubilee, and the command contained in a single passage (Num., x, 10), that in the day of gladness, in the solemn days, and in the beginnings of the months, over the burnt-offerings and over the sacrifices of the peace-offerings the silver trumpets were to sound; no mention in connection with the ritual of cymbals, harps, timbrels, or psalteries; no mention of sacred song or Levite singers; no music proper entered into the ritual, only the crude and warlike blare of trumpets.

No ordinance of sacred song, no band of Levite singers. The duties of the Levites, in the Book of Numbers, are specially defined. The sons of Gershom were to bear the tabernacle and its hangings on the march; the sons of Kohath bore the altars and the sacred vessels; the sons of Merari were to bear the boards and bands and pillars of the sanctuary. No mention, whatsoever, of any ministry of sacred song. A strange omission this would be, if the "Priestly Code" (so-called) which thus defines the duties of the Levites had been composed in post-Exilic times, when Levite singers—sons of Asaph—cymbals, harp, and song of praise formed leading features in the ritual.

Does it not seem that the Mosaic Code, enjoining no music but the simple sounding of the trumpet-blast, stands far behind these niceties of music and of song, seeming to know nothing of them all?

(3) THE ABSENCE OF THE DIVINE TITLE "LORD OF HOSTS" FROM THE PENTATEUCH.

The expression appears for the first time in the Bible in the passage, I Samuel, i, 3, "And this man went up out of his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of Hosts in Shiloh."

After this it occurs in a number of the remaining books of the Bible, and with increasing frequency. The pre-Samuelitic period

of the history of Israel is thus differentiated from the post-Samuelitic period by this circumstance—that in connection with the former period this title is never used, whilst in connection with the latter it is used, and with growing frequency at all stages of the history, even down to the end of the Book of the Prophet Malachi, occurring altogether 281 times.

In this condition of things there is, of course, nothing anomalous on the “conservative” view of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. The fact of this title for God not occurring in the Pentateuch or Joshua would merely mean, that at the time these books were virtually composed—that is to say, in the pre-Samuelitic age—this expression “Lord of Hosts” was not in vogue as a title for God, and consequently was not employed by the writers.

But, on the other hand, from the point of view of the Higher Criticism, which attributes the composition and perpetual manipulation of what they term the “Hexateuch”—that is to say, the Pentateuch and Joshua—to writers all of whom lived, *ex hypothesi*, in the post-Samuelitic age, at various periods of the history down to, and even beyond, the latest period over which the Old Testament Scriptures extend, the non-occurrence of this title for God in the “Hexateuch,” the supposed work of such writers seems to demand some adequate explanation. That fragments of work done by so many different hands, and at so many different points of time, at each of which the title for God, “Lord of Hosts,” was in vogue, should, when pieced together in the “Hexateuch,” exhibit this peculiarity of being without this title for God, is certainly a curious result. But when, over against such result, the fact is taken into account that persistent Israelitish and Jewish tradition regarded the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua as the work of the period antecedent to the first recorded use of the title “Lord of Hosts”—that, namely, in the First Book of Samuel—then it will be seen that the tradition indicates a state of things that would be natural, whilst the theories of the Higher Criticism indicate a condition of things which would be unnatural—and that in a very high degree.

Amongst the hypothetical writers whose hand the Critics claim that they are able to detect in the composition or manipulation of the “Hexateuch,” the two who at the present time are held to be the earliest in date are known as the “Yahvist” or “Jehovist” and the “Elohism.” They wrote, according to

Dr. Driver, in the "early centuries of the monarchy." The remaining writers of the Critics' conception have been distributed through the later centuries, the writer of the "Priestly Code," so-called, being placed in the "age subsequent to Ezekiel," and certain of the various manipulators of that code later still. Now, as all these different writers are conceived as having lived in the post-Samuelitic period of Israelitish history, during the whole of which this title for God, "Lord of Hosts," was in vogue, the question seems naturally to arise, How was it that each and all resisted as to this particular title for God the influences of their environment, and never even once employed the expression "Lord of Hosts" in all their handling of the "Hexateuch"?

The "Deuteronomist" has been usually represented by the Critics as very intimately connected in sentiment, and in the point of view from which he regarded the people of Israel, with the prophet Jeremiah. So much has this been the case, that it was the opinion of Colenso (*Pentateuch*, p. 267) that Jeremiah was actually the author of the Book of Deuteronomy. Dr. Driver, too, although he says that this view of Colenso is "certainly incorrect," nevertheless considers that:—

"Jeremiah exhibits marks of it," the influence of Deuteronomy, "on nearly every page; Ezekiel and Isaiah are also evidently influenced by it. If Deuteronomy were composed in the period between Isaiah and Jeremiah, these facts would be exactly accounted for. . . . The *prophetic teaching* of Deuteronomy, the dominant theological ideas . . . approximate to what is found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel."—*Introduction*, p. 88. (The italics are Dr. Driver's.)

Yet, although the "Deuteronomist" is thus supposed by Dr. Driver to have written subsequent to Isaiah, in whose book the title, "Lord of Hosts," or "Lord God of Hosts" occurs sixty-two times, and to approximate in dominant theological ideas to Jeremiah, who uses this title eighty-one times, the title never even once occurs in the supposed composition of the "Deuteronomist" and his redactors, the Book of Deuteronomy.

"JE United," somewhere later than the "Deuteronomist" (Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, p. 249), exhibits the same abstinence from this expression "Lord of Hosts," although the union of the two documents "J" and "E" is supposed also to have been manipulated within the lifetime of Jeremiah.

The same curious phenomenon is exhibited in the work of the assumed writers of the "Priestly Code" which, according to Dr. Driver, was probably "the work of the age subsequent to Ezekiel" (*Introduction*, p. 142).

With this Wellhausen (*Prolegomena*, p. 405) and Kuenen agree, the latter placing (conjecturally, he says) the composition of those portions of the "Priestly Code" which he distinguishes as "P2" between the years 500 and 475 B.C. (*Hexateuch*, p. 306). This time would commence only about twenty years after the Prophet Haggai, who in the two chapters that contain his prophecies, uses the title for Jehovah, "Lord of Hosts," fourteen times, and the prophet Zechariah, in whose book the expression occurs fifty-two times. The promulgation of the "Priestly Code" by Ezra is placed by Wellhausen and Kuenen in the year 444 B.C., that is to say, in the days of Malachi. In the short book of the prophet Malachi the expression "Lord of Hosts" occurs twenty-four times. In the so-called "Priestly Code," needless to say, it never occurs at all.

Thus none of these assumed writers of the "Hexateuch" use this title for Jehovah, "Lord of Hosts"—so much in vogue in the days in which they are supposed to have written—even once.

The absence of this Divine Title from the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua is the more striking, because the following expressions occur closely connecting Jehovah with the armies of Israel:—

Exodus xii, 41.—*Ts^ebaôth Jehovah*, "the hosts of the Lord."—"And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt."

Joshua v, 14.—*Sar Ts^eba Jehovah*, "the captain of the Lord's host."—"Nay: but as captain of the Lord's host am I come."

Joshua v, 15.—*Sar Ts^eba Jehovah*.—"And the captain of the Lord's host said unto Joshua."

So that although *Jehovah Ts^ebaôth*, "Lord of Hosts" does not occur in the Pentateuch or Joshua, *Ts^ebaôth Jehovah* "hosts of the Lord" does—showing that there could be no valid reason why the supposed writers of the Pentateuch and Joshua, all through the later times, when this title for God was so much in vogue, should lay upon themselves a self-denying ordinance to abstain from employing the title in the "Hexateuch."

In point of fact, the tone of the Pentateuch and Joshua is altogether in favour of the use of this Divine Title, which makes the phenomenon of its non-occurrence all the more remarkable. The explanation would seem to be, that the tone of thought was present in the days of Moses and Joshua, but that it had not then crystallised into the sublime title for God in which it was afterwards expressed.

So whilst the hosts of Israel designated by the word "*Ts'ba*"—so rarely applied to the "armies of the alien"—are called the "*Hosts of the Lord*," and he who appeared to Joshua in the plains of Jericho is called "the *captain of the Lord's Host*"—the title for God, *Jehovah Ts'ba'ôth*, "*Lord of Hosts*" never occurs. And whilst in the four last books of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua the Divine Title "Lord" occurs more than 1,800 times; the title "Lord of Hosts" is never found. "Lord" 1,800 times, "Lord of Hosts" *not once*.

Following the Book of Joshua comes the Book of Judges, and then the short Book of Ruth; and in neither of these books does the Divine Title "Lord of Hosts" occur; it would seem not yet to have been introduced. And then in the First Book of Samuel, first chapter and third verse, the grand name suddenly appears in the statement of a plain matter of fact, but in connection with the Central Sanctuary of Jehovah in Shiloh "Where I set My Name at the first":—

"And this man went up out of his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice unto the 'Lord of Hosts' in Shiloh."

And there in the same name did Hannah pray and vow:—

"And she vowed a vow and said, O Lord of Hosts, if Thou wilt indeed look upon the affliction of Thy handmaid."

In I Samuel, iv, 4, the title occurs as if apparently it had now become part of a recognised designation of the Ark:—

"So the people sent to Shiloh, that they might bring from thence the Ark of the Covenant of the *Lord of Hosts*, which dwelleth between the cherubims."

In II Samuel vi, 2, the title is again connected, and that in a very emphatic manner with the Ark of the Covenant. The passage reads:—

"And David arose, and went with all the people that were with him from Baale of Judah to bring up from thence

the Ark of God, whose name is called by the name of the Lord of Hosts that dwelleth between the cherubims."

"Whose name is called by the name of the Lord of Hosts that dwelleth between the cherubims !"

In reference then to the history of the people of Israel in the post-Samuelitic period the Divine Title "Lord of Hosts" seems to have come to form part of the sacred designation of the Ark of the Covenant. But, on the other hand, in reference to the pre-Samuelitic period it was not so. In the Pentateuch and Joshua the Divine Name occurs in connection with the Ark of the Covenant ten times. The forms which it assumes there are:—

"The Ark of the Covenant of the Lord";

"The Ark of the Covenant of the Lord your God"; and

"The Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, the Lord of the whole earth";

never the "Ark of the Covenant of the Lord of Hosts." Yet the expression "Lord of Hosts" if appropriate to be used in connection with the Ark in the days of Samuel and David, would be likely to be also considered suitable in the same connection for the days of Moses and Joshua. Yes! no doubt! only it so happens that the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua would seem to have been written before the title was introduced.

And not only was this title thus closely associated in the post-Samuelitic age with the Ark of the Covenant, but it was also in poetry closely associated with the city of Jerusalem, and through poetry would be likely to have a strong hold on the hearts of the people. Thus we find in the beautiful 48th Psalm the words, "the city of the Lord of Hosts," used as a poetic expression for Jerusalem:—

"As we have heard, so have we seen in the city of the Lord of Hosts, in the city of our God; God will establish it for ever."

In the 80th Psalm, in which the title occurs four times, and in two different forms, it is actually used with reference to the leading events in the history of the nation related in the Pentateuch, which shows how naturally the title would occur to a

recounter of those events, supposing he lived after it had been invented :—

“ Turn us again, O God of Hosts, and cause Thy face to shine ; and we shall be saved. Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt ; Thou has cast out the heathen, and planted it.”

The deliverance from Egypt ! the conquest of the Promised Land !

From the foregoing it can be seen that in the post-Samuelitic period this Divine Title for God was used by the people of Israel on a variety of different occasions. It is used, for example, where it first appears, in a statement of fact by a writer :—

“ And this man went up out of his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice to the Lord of Hosts in Shiloh ”
(I Sam., i, 3).

It was in the thoughts and words of the elders of the people, and in the shout of the army of Israel, when they sent to Shiloh, “ that they might bring from thence the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord of Hosts which dwelleth between the cherubims ” ; it was on the lips of Hannah as she murmured her prayer to God ; it lived in the sacred poems of the nation ; it was in the heart of David the King, when, after he had brought up the Ark, he “ blessed the people in the name of the Lord of Hosts.”

Now the theory of the Criticism of the present day is, that the “ Hexateuch ” was composed, edited, and manipulated, during a period of more than four hundred years, by motley groups and series of writers, of differing views, and various tendencies. One writer composed one part, and one composed another ; these parts were united by a different hand ; and then another composed a further part ; and this by yet another was united to the two that went before ; and after this another portion was composed by yet another scribe, and afterwards was joined on to the three. Matter was absorbed, interpolated, harmonized, smoothed over, coloured, edited from various points of view, and with different—not to say opposing—motives. And yet when the completed product—the “ Hexateuch ”—coming out of this curious literary seething-pot, is examined, it is found to have this remarkable characteristic—that not one of the manifold manipulators—neither “ J,” nor “ E,” nor “ JE,” nor “ D,” nor “ RD,” nor “ P,” nor “ P2,” nor “ P3,” nor “ P4,” nor any one of the “ Redactors

of P"—who were innumerable—would appear to have allowed himself to be betrayed, even by accident, into using this title, "Lord of Hosts," so much in vogue in the days in which he is supposed to have written; and the "Hexateuch" devoid as it is of this expression, *enshrines an intrinsic, latent, but irrefutable proof* that it could not possibly have been composed in the way asserted by the Criticism, because it would have been a *literary impossibility* for such a number of writers, extending over hundreds of years, to have never—any one of them—even by accident, slipped into the use of this Divine Title for Jehovah, "Lord of Hosts," so much in vogue during those centuries.

In point of fact *the "Hexateuch" was written before the Title was invented.*

And so against the disintegrating theories of the Criticism the Books of the "Hexateuch," welded together as they are by clamps and bonds of union innumerable, have this bond too of union, which is common to them all—that they are without this Divine Title "Lord of Hosts."

These three peculiarities of the Pentateuch to which attention is here drawn, are points absolutely undeniable. No one can say that the name "Jerusalem" does occur in the Pentateuch; no one can say that any mention of Sacred Song *does* occur in the Ritual of the Pentateuch; and no one can say that the Divine Title "Lord of Hosts" *does* occur in the Pentateuch.

And these three undeniable features in the Pentateuch completely destroy the fine-spun sophistries of the Critics, which are embodied in the Graf-Wellhausen theory of its composition.

It seems to the writer that a day will come when the fantastic theories of the Higher Criticism will be held—by the general consent of man—to have been one of the very most extraordinary delusions that ever imposed upon the Scholars of the world.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN showed how much the Rev. Andrew Craig Robinson did to popularize the study of these subjects, and feared that conservative scholarship will lose greatly by his death. In summing up, the discussion, he said: Allow me to remind you of some of our reasons for believing that the Pentateuch took its present form in the days of Moses, or at latest Joshua, and disbelieving the critical hypothesis that the Book of the Law was only

written just before Josiah's time, and the whole Pentateuch not till the time of Ezra.

We have *first* its own *claims* to Mosaic authorship, which Mr. Harvey mentioned. Then its indirect indications of early authorship, as the three texts of Deuteronomy which contain the words, "*When thou art come into the land.*" Deut., xvii, 14 ; xviii, 9 ; xxvi, 1.

Then the fact that the cities of refuge east of Jordan had been named, but not those west, pointing to the latter not being chosen when the account was written.

Then the reasonable opinion of Col. Conder that "the immemorial tradition of the Hebrew nation as to Mosaic authorship is positive evidence."

Then the fact that the Pentateuch shows greater knowledge of Egypt at the time of the Exodus, and of the Sinai peninsula, than are likely to have been available to Jews of Josiah's day.

Deuteronomy contains wonderfully fervent yet reasonable orations. It is extremely difficult to produce such, long after the circumstances arousing the feelings have ceased to operate.

Then we have the argument from the existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch, brought before us here (I think) in 1920. I was much impressed on that occasion by the fact that many speakers in the discussion approached the topic from very different angles ; but none attempted to defend the higher critical view, although some defence in the matter seemed vital to their position.

The long argument about the Central Sanctuary has, in my opinion, gone in favour of the traditional school. Finn reasonably says, "the critical theory requires that the exclusive law of the Central Sanctuary was unknown till the finding of the Book of the Law" in B.C. 621 ; the *evidence* goes to show that it was known and acted on by Hezekiah, a century earlier ; 2 Kings, xviii, 4-22. Again, the *critical* theory appears to demand that we regard the most beautiful and harmonious narratives of Genesis as all composite.

May I refer you to our annual addresses of 1915, 1921 and 1922, which all bear on this subject.

One point in conclusion about the Levites. Our Bibles have maps showing large areas allotted to all the tribes, except the Levites. We believe that they were content to go without lands because assured of the firm attachment of the other tribes to the Mosaic

institutions, and that the offerings would be brought. This does not fit the critical hypothesis at all, and the only explanation that they have or can put forward, is that the Levites were not a *tribe* but a *profession*. So Dr. McNeile in his Book of Exodus, "Westminster Commentary," 1908, says: "If the *beni Lewi*, as a tribe, never had a real existence, it is easier to explain an otherwise extraordinary fact, that they alone are recorded to have received no tribal territory in the land of Canaan. (Deut., x, 8-9.)"

The Levites have certainly believed themselves to be a tribe for many centuries, and the Bible has several consistent statements of Levi's descendants. Now you can turn a tribe into a profession, as many highland clans all became soldiers during the Great War; but, and this is the point, if a people are careful of their genealogies (as the Israelites were), the only way of turning a profession into a *tribe* is to call in all the statements of genealogies, re-sort them, re-write them, and persuade people to accept a new set of grandparents, parents, uncles, aunts, etc. The critical theory is utterly ridiculous in this case.

MR. SIDNEY COLLETT said: I am sure we must all be thankful for such an excellent paper as we have listened to this afternoon. It not only tends to strengthen faith in the Word of God; but deals a heavy blow at the Higher Criticism.

It should never be forgotten that those who dare to commence criticizing the *written* word are inevitably led on, ere long, to criticize the *Living* Word—our blessed Lord Himself!

Here are two examples of what I refer to: In a paper read at the Church Congress at Southampton in October, 1913, one speaker said: "His (Christ's) every utterance, on every subject, cannot be accepted as the infallible expression of Divine Omniscience." . . . "His knowledge of all matters scientific, literary or historical, was the *knowledge of His time*, relative and contingent." . . . "The original teaching of Christ, if we possessed His *ipsissima verba*, would not give us that particular kind of external and literal infallibility and finality which so many desire."

While, in an article contributed to the "British Weekly" some years ago, the Rev. Professor Adeney (whose words I almost tremble to quote) said: "It was distressful to hear a reader of one of the papers at the Congregational Union Assembly declare that

he preferred the authority of Christ to the authority of modern critics in regard to matters of Biblical history ! ! ”

Now it is a most interesting and helpful fact that when the Devil assailed our Lord with his threefold temptations in the Wilderness, Christ, Who might easily have driven the Devil away in a moment by His Divine Power, nevertheless condescended to use the very weapon that is given us for use under similar circumstances ; that is to say, He quoted three passages of Holy Scripture. And, moreover, those three passages He deliberately chose from the very Book in the Old Testament, which the critics have attacked more than any other—the Book of Deuteronomy !

Now if that Book really is the fraudulent patchwork that the Critics declare it to be, is it likely that our Divine Lord would have selected all His quotations from such a Book ? And, further, would not the Devil, who knows far more than the Critics know, have been only too ready to remind our Lord that it was no use quoting from that Book, inasmuch as it was not the Divinely inspired Book that some thought it to be ?

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS reminded the Meeting of the last paper read by the late Mr. Craig Robinson on the language of the Book of Daniel as showing the wide range of his scholarship.

The speaker said he possessed one of the Books of Moses printed in the different colours which critics use to indicate different writers. This variegated production reminded him of Joseph's coat of many colours which his father, the patriarch Jacob, beheld with such sadness being stained with his blood. With such sadness must be regarded such a production as the critics' Pentateuch. He could only account for the so-called Higher Critics' adherence to their discredited theories by their disinclination to admit the supernatural in Revelation. If Moses was the author of Exodus, he was an eye-witness, whose story of the miraculous deliverance of Israel from Egypt it would be impossible to disbelieve. This did not mean that every line of the Pentateuch was written by Moses. No doubt there were additions made by subsequent writers, such as the account of Moses' death and burial, and the characterisation of himself as the meekest of men, which could hardly have proceeded from his pen. These portions were doubtless added under Divine guidance.

He associated himself with Mr. Collett in claiming our Lord's unimpeachable authority for the Mosaic authorship, and pointed out that in the earliest Gospel, Mark vii, 10, we had our Lord's words recorded, "Moses said, 'Honour thy father, etc.," and more than once in the Gospel of John, whose narrative showed clearly that the writer was an eye-witness, we had our Lord's reference to Moses having written. These statements that Moses spoke and wrote certain things were to him stronger than a mere reference to the Books of Moses, which might be explained away as a use of the accepted title.

Mr. J. HARVEY said: I had not intended to say anything, but the very excellent paper to which we have listened refers to an assertion of the modernist that the Pentateuch was not in existence before it was composed by a group of priests, a little before the Babylonish exile. It is inconceivable that they should have written it for the first time, and yet be all agreed that Moses wrote it; for they say so, unless, indeed, they deliberately conspired to deceive their readers, which sounds as if we are asked to believe the incredible. We could quite understand how, after the long fifty-five years' reign of Manasseh and the two of his son Amon little or no vestige of the law of Moses may have survived. And we are, therefore, perplexed to account for Josiah's adherence to Jehovah, being the son and grandson of two notoriously idolatrous kings, as also succeeding them at the age of eight years, unless he had been taught and brought up in the law of Moses by those who knew it. We know that the Book of Exodus has a very good proof of its having been written in the land of Moab, from its own internal evidence, in the words of xvi, 35, and of xl, 38, while the thirteenth chapter sounds decidedly as if it had either been written on the spot [Succoth] or expanded afterwards from the first page of an Exodus diary. And, to my mind, the Book of Genesis in l, 10, 11, in which the two words "beyond Jordan" occur, if carefully studied in the details of the whole chapter, has a strong claim to its authorship in the land of Moab.

Mr. W. HOSTE said: I am not surprised that the "Critics" prefer to leave papers like that of Mr. Robinson alone. It is more convenient to assume that your own conclusions are "assured" and "inevitable" than to meet *seriatim* the arguments of opponents.

May I call attention to another line of argument from an idiom peculiar to the Pentateuch? Some will remember that in the later stages of the Dreyfus affair a document, purporting to be a torn-up letter pieced together and accepted at first as conclusive evidence of the guilt of the accused, was discovered to be a forgery by the fact that when held up to the light the paper exhibited two distinct and diverse watermarks, and had clearly never formed a single document. The case of the Pentateuch is exactly the reverse. According to the Modernists, it is a compilation of four chief documents, J, E, D and P, written from 750 to 1000 years after the events. J and E are supposed to be more or less honest attempts at history, though, as Wellhausen charitably explains, "always and everywhere covered over with the many-coloured robe of fancy," a not bad description, perhaps, of his own, and his disciples' subjective theories. But D and P are both deliberate concoctions in the interests of their class, with Moses' name forged at the bottom, the result being, as Dr. R. Sinker, of Cambridge, puts it, "just as honest, just as defensible, just as much an outrage on God's truth as the False Decretals." But Cheyne makes God a party to the fraud, asserting of these amiable forgers that He put it into their minds "to take a bold step forward"! He must have meant "the god of this world." The Redactor is supposed to have compiled the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch), not by assimilating his authorities and writing a history, but by a diligent use of scissors and paste-pot, taking out a chapter here and a paragraph, a sentence or even a word there from his four documents. What sort of heterogeneous conglomerate should we expect from such a process? Much the same as though a history of the early Christian Churches were compiled by gumming together excerpts from Robertson's Early Church History, some treatise of Arius, the Forged Decretals, and Peter Parley's tales of the Roman Empire. To assert that the Pentateuch was built up in this way would, in any other sphere than religion, be considered an amusing farce; here it is a tragedy. But what if we could find one common watermark across all these documents in spite of their supposed heterogeneity. Anyone with a small knowledge of Hebrew knows that **הוּא** = he, and **היא** = she. But, as Gesenius points out, **הוּא**, according to the archaic Pentateuch idiom is epicene, that is, stands for feminine as well as masculine (*e.g.* Gen. iii, 12). The Masorah on Gen. xxxviii, 25, gives

eleven passages in all in the Pentateuch, where **היא** is used for "she"; in all other cases it is **היא**, though, as Gesenius again points out, it is wrongly printed **היא**, in the ordinary Hebrew editions. Outside the Pentateuch he quotes only three places, Kings xvii, 15, Job xxxi, 11, and Isa. xxx, 33, where this epicene usage is found. To meet this difficulty it has been suggested that **היא** was the archaic form = he and she, thus getting rid of the troublesome medial letter, but this seems an argument *ad hoc*, with no serious basis. This Pentateuchal idiom is well known, but perhaps it is not so well known that, as Dr. Sinker points out in his "Higher Criticism," p. 81, it is *common to all the critical strata of the Pentateuch*—J. E. D. and P. God has written his own watermark—this short word **היא**—across the documents forming the Pentateuch, and pronounced them contemporaneous and to all intents and purposes one.