

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

shared between Him and the world, the greater is the grace with which He aids and strengthens our weak endeavours to yield ourselves to Him, and with which He rewards our compliance with His demands. As there is no limit to the consecration that He seeks, so there is none to the sanctification that He grants.

It is a marvellous depth of love and grace that is revealed in this reading of the passage. And when, as we have said, we remember the early date of the Epistle and realize the intensity of conviction as to the Holy Ghost that is displayed in this passage, we must feel that in the first days—the years succeeding the Pentecostal illapse of the Spirit—there prevailed among at least the Jewish believers a persuasion of the personality of the Holy Ghost, His close relationship both in being and mission with the other Persons of the Trinity, His love for the members of the Church redeemed by Christ, His inhabitation of them in Divine power, and His resolve to win and possess them entirely for God, and to bestow upon them all needful grace and strength to enable them to realize the end and object of their calling, which we may well long and pray may be revived in our own days as the preliminary to a great and far-reaching work of grace in the modern Church.



Higher Criticism and Historical Criticism.

By HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B.

IN their division of the Pentateuch into its supposed sources the Higher Critics rely on a number of difficulties in the historical narrative. Thus, in his edition of Deuteronomy, Dr. Driver sets out a number of real or supposed discrepancies in nine paragraphs.¹ It is proposed carefully to investigate the

¹ "Deuteronomy," pp. xxxv, xxxvi.

worst of these in the present paper. Dr. Driver states it as follows :

“i. 46, ii. 1, 14. As shown in the notes on pp. 31-33, it seems impossible to harmonize the representation contained in these passages with that of Numbers. According to Num. xiv., etc., the thirty-eight years in the wilderness were spent at Kadesh ; according to Deuteronomy, they were spent *away* from Kadesh (ii. 14), in wandering about Edom ” (ii. 1) [“Deuteronomy,” p. xxxvi].

Unfortunately for Dr. Driver, it does not seem to have occurred to him to compare Deuteronomy with Numbers before making this statement. Instead he has studied the fragments that he assigns to JE, and it is to a consideration of the remarkable narrative that he has discovered in those fragments that the note to which he refers is devoted. It is explicitly stated in Num. xxxii. 13 that God made the Israelites “wander to and fro in the wilderness forty years,” and a careful examination of the other chapters of Numbers gives precisely the same result. That examination we must now undertake.

After leaving Hazeroth, the Israelites pitched in the wilderness of Paran (Num. xii. 16 JE). Thence the spies set out (Num. xiii. 3 P). They returned and came to the congregation “unto the wilderness of Paran (P) to Kadesh (JE)” (Num. xiii. 26). I pause for a moment to note the effect of dividing the last verse between P and JE. First, it enables some critics (including Dr. Driver) to say that there are here two different traditions. According to one of these (P), the spies were sent out from the wilderness of Paran, while in the other (JE) they went from Kadesh, which is in the wilderness of Zin.¹ Other critics, on the other hand, maintain that Kadesh was in the wilderness of Zin, but that as the wilderness of Paran was near by, and P was not a very accurate person, he said that Kadesh was in the wilderness of Paran. Secondly, it gives them the benefit of having a narrative (JE) which brings the Israelites

¹ “In P the spies start from the ‘wilderness of Paran’ (xiii. 3 ; cf. ver. 26). In JE, though it is not here so stated, it may be inferred from Num. xxxii. 8 (cf. Deut. i. 19 ; Josh. xiv. 6) that they started from *Kadesh* ; and with this agree the words *to Kadesh* in xiii. 26.”—DRIVER : *Literature of the O. T.* 7th ed., p. 63 (the section dealing with Num. xiii., xiv.).

from Hazeroth to the wilderness of Paran, but never explains how they reached Kadesh. Thirdly, it makes the narrative of JE, as understood by Dr. Driver, wholly impossible. According to this version, they arrive at Kadesh in the third year. There was no water there, but the people bore it meekly till the thirty-ninth year, when, according to Dr. Driver ("Deuteronomy," p. xxxv), the incident of striking the rock occurred at Kadesh. Fourthly, it makes JE tell a story that cannot be reconciled with either P or D, inasmuch as both the latter "documents" tell us that the Israelites wandered during the period succeeding the mission of the spies, while the former makes them stationary. Fifthly, it gives us a JE narrative in which for thirty-eight years not the slightest notice is taken of a direct and definite command of God, which, according to Deuteronomy, was duly carried out. Here are the two passages :

JE.

"To-morrow turn ye, and get you into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea" (Num. xiv. 25).

D.

"Then we turned, and took our journey into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea, as the LORD spake unto me. . . . And the days in which we came from Kadesh-barnea, until we were come over the brook Zered, were thirty and eight years" (Deut. ii. 1, 14).¹

¹ This passage (*cf.* Judg. xi. 16-18) clearly proves that the Israelites could not have made a second visit to Kadesh-barnea, as is assumed by some writers—*e.g.*, URQUHART, *New Biblical Guide*, vol. iv., pp. 163, 183. It should be noticed that there are *historical* grounds for thinking that Num. xx. 14-22a and xxi. 4b-9 have been accidentally transposed from their original positions in the narrative. Besides harmonizing all these passages, such a hypothesis would (1) lessen the chronological difficulties attaching to the present arrangement of the concluding chapters of Numbers on the interpretations now current, and also (2) explain the statement in Num. xxxiii. 36 that the Israelites were at Ezion-geber (*on the Red Sea*) *before* pitching at Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin, while, according to the present arrangement of Num. xxi., they journey by the way to the Red Sea *after* leaving Kadesh and Mount Hor. This view accords with the statements of Deut. ii. to the effect that the Israelites first compassed Mount Seir, and then went North (*i.e.*, from Ezion-geber) and passed through the border of Edom (vers. 2-8).

It must be conceded even by the worst enemies of the Higher Criticism that the division of Num. xiii. 26 offers very great advantages from Dr. Driver's point of view. The narrative in Numbers and Deuteronomy was not, perhaps, easy or well arranged, but it was at least intelligible, possible, and self-consistent. The narratives of the sources are at hopeless variance with one another, and involve flagrant absurdities, while they throw grave doubt on the whole historical tradition.

The narrative of the mission of the spies in Numbers contains no further indication of place. But if we turn to the itinerary in chap. xxxiii., we find in ver. 18 that the Israelites journeyed from Hazeroth, and pitched in Rithmah. It is not known on what principles this itinerary was compiled. It is thus impossible to offer any opinion as to whether Kadesh-barnea in the wilderness of Paran is identical with Rithmah or not. But this much is certain: the mission of the spies occurred at an early date in the desert period, for the Israelites subsequently wandered till all the grown men of that generation (with numerically insignificant exceptions) were consumed. On the other hand, the arrival at Kadesh (Meribah), in the desert of Zin, was near the end of the wanderings, for the next stage mentioned is Mount Hor, where Aaron died on the first day of the fifth month of the fortieth year (Num. xxxiii. 37, 38). The differences of date, therefore, show that Kadesh-barnea and Meribah are not identical. This is confirmed by another circumstance narrated in Num. xx., which contains the narrative of the striking of the rock. The spies had made their report at Kadesh, in the wilderness of Paran. The children of Israel had then been ordered to turn and get into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea (Num. xiv. 25). From Deut. ii. 1 it appears that this had been done. Now we read: "And the children of Israel, even the whole congregation, came into the wilderness of Zin in the first month: and the people abode in Kadesh" (Num. xx. 1). The year is not stated, but from the considerations just advanced it is probable that it was in one of the last years of the wanderings. It is clear that if the narrative

in Numbers is to be taken to mean what it says, this Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin cannot be identified with Kadesh-barnea in the wilderness of Paran. As the Israelites had already been at the latter, according to Dr. Driver, for many years, it would have been impossible for them to "come into the wilderness of Zin" in order to get there. That there should be two places of similar name is no ground for surprise when it is remembered that Kadesh only means sanctuary, and that sanctuaries were extremely common in Semitic antiquity.¹

The net result of this inquiry, therefore, is not to establish an inconsistency between Deuteronomy and Numbers, but to show how untenable the critical division of the latter book really is, and how unwarrantably Dr. Driver has dealt with the question.²

¹ Incidentally this reasoning disposes of another argument of the Higher Critics, which may be stated in Mr. Carpenter's words. In dealing with alleged chronological difficulties, he writes as follows: "A second and more significant instance occurs in Num. xx. The Israelites arrive at Kadesh in the first month (ver. 1), apparently of the third year, reckoning from the Exodus, the last previous date marking the departure from Sinai in the second month of the second year (x. 11). In xx. 22 the march is resumed, and in consequence of the refusal of Edom to allow a passage through its territory, a long circuit is necessary. The first stage brings them to Mount Hor, where Aaron dies upon the summit. In the list of the encampments in xxxiii. 37 this incident is fixed in the fortieth year of the wanderings. Between xx. 1 and 22 . . ., there is thus an interval of at least thirty-seven years (*cp.* Deut. ii. 14, from Kadesh to the brook Zered thirty-eight years). Is it credible that the 'journals' of Moses found nothing worthy of record in this long period beyond a solitary instance of popular discontent, and a fruitless embassy to the King of Edom? Did an entire generation pass away, without any further trace than the bones of its 'fighting men' upon the wilderness? Only at a later day could imaginative tradition have rounded off the whole into a fixed form of forty years, and been content to leave the greater part a blank" ("The Oxford Hexateuch," i., p. 28). It will be clear from the text that Mr. Carpenter's chronology will not bear investigation. It is, however, worth noting that he implicitly assumes that the Pentateuch was intended to be a fortuitous record of promiscuous facts, and that silence as to such facts is therefore good evidence of ignorance. Yet the very name by which the book has so long been known—the Law—might have suggested to him that the author's purpose was quite different from that so arbitrarily attributed to him.

² This paper was written before the appearance of Dr. Orr's valuable and fascinating book, "The Problem of the Old Testament."