

leading men of the two Presbyterian Churches and conferred with them as Christian Brethren.

"The prospect is good. I hope it may not be marred by human frailty. In God's own time union and harmony will come."

My task is finished. And as I close this paper comes the report of the treasurer of the Representative Church Council ("the most satisfactory report made for some time"), showing increased contributions under every head save one—that of Education—where the decrease amounts to only £15. And to compensate for this last slight falling-off comes, also, the announcement that an anonymous donor has offered to supply a new class-room to the Dalry Training College for School-mistresses. Happy omen, when even the most tried of the Church's causes shows returning strength!

H. D. HENDERSON.

ART. V.—NOTES ON GENESIS XLVIII.—I.

IN this paper we reach Jacob's death-bed speech. As it stands in chap. xlviii., though it is assigned to P, it follows most naturally on the account of Jacob's sickness, which, nevertheless, Kautzsch and Socin assign to E and J, vers. 1 and 2*a* being declared to be from the former, and ver. 2*b* from the latter. The extraordinary insight which professes to distinguish between J and E in passages such as these is very reasonably disclaimed by Professor Driver, who admits that it is not always easy to disentangle one from the other. But the ingenuity which distinguishes ver. 2 from ver. 3, though it has received the Professor's imprimatur, is quite as surprising, as may be seen by a glance at the English version. As anyone may see by reading it, there is no solution of continuity in the passage as it stands. Save for the phrase, "be fruitful and multiply," which the critics are compelled to assign to P, because they occur in Gen. i., there is no ground for supposing a change of author. There is no break or contradiction here—no awkward hiatus of any kind. The speech is such a one as would be likely to be made by the aged patriarch under the circumstances described in the passage assigned to JE, but it does not fit on to P at all. There is a decided hiatus in the narrative ascribed to P, and one of the most awkward kind, as will be seen by looking at the two passages consecutively. "And Jacob lived in the land of Egypt seventeen years: so the days of Jacob, the years of his life, were an hundred and forty-seven years. And Jacob

said unto Joseph, God Almighty (El Shaddai) appeared unto me at Luz in the land of Canaan," etc. The narrative, as it stands, brings Joseph into Jacob's presence on a momentous occasion, to which the solemn and affectionate address of the elder patriarch is entirely suitable. He has brought his two sons with him, and to this circumstance the father at once refers. Take away, as the critics do, the intervening verses between xlvii. 28 and xlviii. 3, and the narrative displays at once what Wellhausen calls "Spuren der Brüchigkeit." For, be it observed, we do not arrive at a coherent narrative on the separation theory; we only break a coherent narrative up into a number of disjointed fragments. This is true here as elsewhere.¹ We do not know why Joseph has come to his father. In fact, on critical principles he has never come to him at all. P "knows nothing" of such a visit, though he has something to say of what occurred at it. This, to say the least, is very strange. Ephraim, and Manasseh too, are brought into the narrative in a surprisingly sudden and violent manner. According to Kautzsch and Socin, P "knows nothing" of them. All that P knows is that Joseph had two sons (xli. 50). Their names are not known to him, but only to the redactor, to whom chap. xlvi. 8-27 is attributed by these critics. Thus, criticism converts a perfectly natural and consecutive story into a succession of jerks and jolts, which would be amazing even in a writer of a mere abstract, such as P is supposed to be.

Then we have the primitive name Luz, used here by Jacob, most naturally if our author has a primitive and authentic narrative before him, but utterly inexplicable if the passage before us is the work of a post-exilic writer, composing his work years after the name Luz has been forgotten, but when Bethel must have been a name thoroughly familiar to him. It is even possible that Jacob may be explaining to Joseph here where Luz is, as he had been so long an exile in Egypt. The same may be said, once again, of the antiquated name Ephrath for Bethlehem in ver. 7. This verse is assigned by Kautzsch and Socin to the redactor. But no one, so far as I know, has attempted to explain why the redactor disinters these ancient names, long since forgotten. It is at least most unreasonable to suppose—I do not know if the explanation has ever been suggested—that he did so to give verisimilitude

¹ It had escaped my notice that El Shaddai appears in a passage (xliii. 14) assigned by Kautzsch and Socin to E. They are equal to the occasion, and promptly assign the expression in question to the redactor. What reason the redactor had in thus breaking the continuity of the narrative to bring in an obsolete expression we are not told. But on the theory that we have here a primitive narrative of the history of Joseph, its introduction is natural enough.

to his narrative. If so, he took a vast deal of very unnecessary trouble in an uncritical age, such as that in which he is, on all hands, supposed to have been writing. But on the supposition that we have before us an ancient narrative, the use of the ancient name for Bethlehem would occur as a matter of course, and the gloss "the same is Bethlehem" would naturally be appended in later times, and as naturally creep into the text.

Criticism has managed to assign the expression קהל, occurring in the sense of "a company" of people or nations, to P wherever it occurs (xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xlvi. 4), and it must be confessed that in these cases it occurs, not alone, but in company with other phrases regarded as characteristic of the post-exilic author. Arbitrary, however, this selection remains, since the expressions in question are just as likely to be characteristic of the author of Genesis as of the author of a certain part of Genesis. Still, the assignment is less arbitrary here than where a half or quarter verse is severed arbitrary from a consecutive narrative, on account of the occurrence of a word which is assumed to be a characteristic of a certain source, or when, as we have just seen, the words El Shaddai are struck out of a coherent narrative and assigned to another author, in deference to the necessities of a theory. But criticism has not managed to deal quite as satisfactorily with the expression כְּבֵרֵת אֲרִיָּן, which occurs here (ver. 7) and in chap. xxxv. 16.¹ The latter passage is assigned to JE by Kautzsch and Socin, and Wellhausen thinks there is a confusion of sources in the chapter. Ver. 7 of the present chapter is assigned by Kautzsch and Socin to the redactor, by Professor Driver to P with a query. He may well put a query, for, if the passage be indeed P's, he is quoting xxxv. 16 (JE) verbatim, as anyone can see. And if he quotes JE verbatim, he must have had JE before him. If, as is further asserted, he repeatedly contradicts JE, he must have done so not in ignorance, but on purpose. If so, what was his purpose? Moreover, if he omits anything contained in JE, he cannot, if he has had access to JE, be said to "know nothing" of what he does not record. "Omission," then, "is not prohibition," or contradiction, but quite the contrary. Omission, in that case, is a sign of approval. Thus, the sharp lines of demarcation criticism has drawn between JE and P are proved to have no existence. Kautzsch and Socin, therefore, in

¹ The expression occurs also in 2 Kings v. 19. It is odd, on the theories of the critics, that this expression is known only to P and the North-Israelite biographer of Elisha, and that, though known to the post-exilic writers, the Septuagint translators cannot translate it.

referring ver. 7 to the redactor, are wiser in their generation than Professor Driver. He is an extremely convenient person, this redactor, as we have frequently seen. When the critical barque is on the rocks or the quicksands, the redactor takes her in tow, and brings her off again triumphantly. It is the redactor, therefore, of course, who, having *ex hypothesi* JE before him, is quoting it here. But then why has Professor Driver any doubt whatever on the point?

Ver. 16 contains one or two points of interest. We all of us know the striking passage in Exod. xxiii. which refers to the Angel of the Covenant. This passage is said by critics to form a portion of the "Book of the Covenant," the oldest part, so the critics say, of the Hexateuch. It is referred to several times in the portions assigned to JE. And a reference to this Angel occurs here in a passage assigned to JE. But if the critical theory be unsound here, the whole history gains in force and in coherence. We all know the very prominent part angels play in the patriarchal history, and especially in that of Jacob. They appear to him in Bethel, and the thought of their ministrations never leaves him. He mentions it continually, not only in JE, but also in P (xxxv. 9-15). The being with whom he wrestled was doubtless believed by him to be the Angel who redeemed him from all evil. It is far more reasonable to suppose that Moses gained his idea of angelic superintendence from the patriarch than that the belief in that superintendence is deduced by JE from the passage in the supposed "Book of the Covenant" in Exod. xxiii. I may remark parenthetically that the hortatory passage in Exod. xxiii. is singularly like Deuteronomy in form. Even Professor Driver admits there is a resemblance. And if these hortatory passages occur in the very earliest portion of the Law, we cannot assume it to be impossible that they were addressed to a people who *had a faith in God already*—a faith handed down by tradition from their fathers. The faith presupposed in Exod. xxiii. is *the faith of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*—a faith which may have grown dim, but which has never died.¹

The whole chapter is a little improbable, unless it be authentic history. For both J and E—that is to say, the presumed Jewish and North-Israelitish writers—represent Ephraim as having been placed before Manasseh, and the two sons of Joseph are stated *by P* as having been placed on an equality with the sons of Jacob. Now, first of all, it was extremely unlikely that the Jewish writer J should have devoted himself, if we suppose him to be more or less *invent-*

¹ We have in this verse a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον ἰσῆ, which, if critical methods are correct, oblige us to postulate an altogether new author here.

ing his facts, to celebrating the greatness of Ephraim, considering that Ephraim was, and always had been, the head of the confederacy against Judah. It is also extremely unlikely that the compiler, who must have been Jewish, would have inserted this passage in his compilation. Neither is it very probable that P, whose history is thought to have been composed after the return from the Captivity, would be the historian to give us the account of the high position assigned to Joseph and Ephraim by Jacob, when P's object, according to the critics, was to glorify Judah and to magnify Israel's disobedience — Israel, be it observed, being very largely dominated by Ephraim. That P should have invented such a scene as is here described is impossible. That he would have mentioned it is unlikely; that the redactor would have inserted it is exceedingly improbable. But on the hypothesis that the history is authentic, and not composed to support preconceived notions, the whole story is reasonable enough. Joseph was the best and best beloved of Jacob's sons. His descendants enjoy the pre-eminence, therefore, throughout all the earlier history of Israel. It is not till the time of David that the hegemony devolves upon Judah, and its ultimate result is to awaken the jealousy of the tribes of Joseph, and to dismember the monarchy. The more true the incident here described, the more intelligible Israelite history becomes. "The blessing of Jacob," says Professor Driver, "is, of course" (why "of course" does not appear quite clear), "incorporated by J from an independent source. It may have been in circulation either as a separate piece or as part of a collection of sacred poetry." Possibly; or it may be that the actual blessing of the patriarch has been handed down in a poetical form. For, first of all, it assumes the correctness of the history as it stands. The conduct of Reuben, Simeon, and Levi are all well known to the writer. The prophecy about the "scattering" of the tribe of Levi, though fulfilled, would hardly have been handed down by a "priestly" redactor, writing when the priesthood had been assigned to that tribe, and when it was the object of the compilation to glorify it as much as possible. In fact, it seems hardly probable that it could have been invented after the time, whenever criticism supposes that to be, when Levi had become the sacerdotal tribe. Then, again, the song could hardly have been written after the separation of the Ten Tribes, since the praises of Joseph were hardly likely to be sung by their inveterate enemies. Or even supposing it came from a North-Israelitish source, and was actually composed at a later period, it still remains difficult to explain its embodiment in a history which was compiled for objects against which it

certainly appears very strongly to militate.¹ There is yet another objection to its composition after the revolt of the Ten Tribes. The description it contains was then no longer applicable to the tribe of Joseph. The history of that tribe after Jeroboam's rebellion was a history of very rapid declension. Defeat, disgrace, civil war, misfortunes of all kinds, fell upon the unfortunate Northern kingdom. Beside the improbability that a prediction so absurdly incompatible with the facts would ever have become incorporated into the Jewish history, there is the additional strong improbability that the Chauvinistic spirit could have reached so high a development in the Northern kingdom that its poets, after the separation of the Ten Tribes, could venture to paint a picture of the tribe of Joseph such as is contained in *xlix.* 22-28. We must, therefore, of necessity place this blessing before the reign of Saul, when Ephraim for the first time lost its pre-eminence in Israel. And this view is corroborated by the silence of the blessing on the subject of the hegemony of Benjamin, so pointedly referred to in *Ps. lxxviii.* 27. It may be added that Deborah's song appears to point to the existence in her time of Jacob's blessing, and to endeavour to emphasize the declension of Israel by the contrast. True criticism will not meet difficulties such as these with a high-handed "of course," but will estimate them carefully and discuss them fairly. Not till this has been done shall we be in a position to fix the date of the document, or to assign it authoritatively to the true source. One point more in reference to it before we pass on. At whatever date it was composed, even were it written subsequent to the exile, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the words "until Shiloh come" (or "until he come to Shiloh"), and "unto him shall the obedience of the peoples be," are a distinct prophecy of Jesus Christ. And if in the Pentateuch there be one undoubted prophecy, why should we contend that other prophecies must needs have been written after the event?

Chap. xlix. 28a is given by the critics to the redactor, so that the portion assigned to P in this chapter consists only of the first part of ver. 1 and vers. 28b-33, with the exception of the words "he gathered up his feet into the bed," in ver. 33, which are, rather strangely, assigned to JE by Kautzsch and Socin. The reason, presumably, is that P has never mentioned the bed. But we have, of course, no explanation of the reason why the redactor should have left off copying P and betaken himself to JE for such an unimportant insertion.

¹ "In the latter days" simply means "in time to come." It does not necessarily involve the *ultimate* fate of any tribe.

This consideration increases the probability that Gen. *xlvi*., *xlix*. is a consecutive narrative by one author, save the song of Jacob, which it is by no means necessary to suppose was, as it stands, the actual composition of Jacob himself, but which may very probably have been an early poetical embodiment of the substance of his blessing.

Of the latter part of ver. 28, assigned to P, we may remark that "every man according to his blessing he blessed them," presupposes the blessing which precedes it. Whether Jacob's blessing is inserted by P or not, the document must therefore certainly have been known to him in substance, and it is a question whether the marked reference to it in this verse must not be held to imply that he inserted it *in extenso*. The remark has already been made that the words "and there I buried Leah" fall naturally from the lips of the patriarch, but do not fall so naturally from the lips of a writer whose object it is to invent or embellish the details of the covenant between God and the progenitors of the chosen people. An inventor of post-exilic times would almost certainly have buried Rachel, Jacob's favourite wife, as well as Leah, in the tomb at Machpelah. It is hardly likely, again, that he would have displayed ingenuity enough to cause Leah to be buried at Machpelah because she was the ancestress of the Jews. Had he been possessed of this amount of ingenuity he would have gone further. He would doubtless have excluded from his narrative all the allusions we find to Jacob's preference for Rachel. The more one examines the Book of Genesis, the more one recognises the naturalness, the artlessness, the transparent honesty, the absence of contrivance, which are the signs of a genuine narrative, and make the compilation theory, in its present shape, absolutely irreconcilable with the phenomena before us. It is a small matter, but if, with the critics, we make chap. l. 12, 13 follow immediately on *xlix*. 28b-33, the repetition of the details about the cave at Machpelah in the latter passage becomes absurd and nauseating, even for P. And it is a curious instance of the inconsistency of the criticism with which we are dealing that, while sometimes repetition is an indubitable sign of another hand, we are nevertheless told that repetition is a characteristic of P,¹ and not only here, but elsewhere, as has been already pointed out more than once in these papers. We are asked to believe that P, with "damnable iteration," insisted on repeating what he had already said, not after a considerable interval, but immediately before his most unnecessary repetition of it.

¹ Driver, "Introduction," pp. 11, 122.

The embalming of Joseph, attributed to JE, is a remarkable feature in the story. It was not the "manner of the Jews," as we know, to "bury" after this sort. We have no hint of embalment on any other occasion in Genesis or elsewhere in the Old Testament. We may be pretty sure that such a feature in the story was not an invention. Still less, were it possible, could it be an invention of a writer of "the eighth or ninth century B.C." The author or authors of Genesis, whosoever they may have been, and whosoever they may have written, had evidently authentic materials before them. The only possible explanation of this passage is that Joseph, from his long residence in Egypt, had been partially Egyptianized, and that he further saw the advantage of embalment as a means of carrying out the wish of his father to be interred in the land of Canaan. It is further remarkable that, if we may trust Kautzsch and Socin, the same idea occurred spontaneously to the North and South Israelite writers of J and E respectively. J embalms Jacob; E embalms Joseph (chap. l. 26).¹ No wonder the idea that J and E can be satisfactorily disentangled from each other had reluctantly to be abandoned, when such close signs of agreement between them are found. We may confidently look forward to the day when the era of foregone conclusions will come to an end, and when the early books of the Old Testament will be studied without prejudice. And then it will be seen that, despite the marvellous skill, patience, and industry with which the alleged narrative of P has been disengaged from the rest of Genesis, it is far too closely combined with the other portions to admit of the treatment which has been meted out to it.

One further point has occurred to me since I wrote on Mamre and the burial-place of Abraham. I referred to the statement of the narrative that the children of Heth "were in possession of the city at that time, and remarked that it postulates an early, not a late, date for the chapter, because (1) the Book of Joshua speaks, not of the children of Heth in connection with Hebron, but of the children of Anak; and (2) because we now know from history that the Hittite power had received a decisive check, previous to the exodus, from the arms of Rameses II. I may add, in confirmation of this argument, that Esau's wives were taken from among the

¹ Dr. Watson ("The Book of Genesis," p. 60) quotes Dr. R. S. Poole as saying: "The Egyptian documents emphatically call for a reconsideration of the date of the Pentateuch. It could not have been written," he avers, "much later than B.C. 1300, while the memory of the events was fresh. The minute accuracy of the text is inconsistent with any later date."

Hittites, that Rebekah speaks of herself as dreading that Jacob should marry with the "daughters of Heth." We know that Isaac ultimately broke up his encampment at Beer-la-hai-roi. He was driven thence by a famine. He led a wandering life for some time, and died, as we are told, at Mamre. At Mamre, therefore, among the children of Heth, we may imagine Esau and Jacob entering into friendly relations with the Hittites, and the former ultimately contracting marriage alliances with them. What is remarkable in the matter is that Gen. xxvii. 46 is assigned to the redactor. It is P and the redactor, then, writing after the exile, who make this masterly guess at the political conditions of Palestine more than a thousand years previously—a guess, strange to say, entirely corroborated by the recent discoveries among the monuments. We have here, then, another strong argument in favour of the conclusion that the author of Genesis, whoever he may have been, was, if not himself an early writer, at least no fabulist, but a man in possession of authentic information.

—◆◆—

J. J. LIAS.

ART. VI.—SOME MODERN VIEWS OF OUR LORD.

EVER since Hess published his "History of the Life of Jesus" in 1768, one of the first attempts to explain and defend the Gospel miracles, scarcely any German theologian has omitted to put forward a Christology of some kind. Herder, Paulus, Schleiermacher, Hase, Neander, Ebrard, Weisse, Ewald, Keim, Baur, Strauss, and Harnack, are a goodly list of writers who have taken a deep interest in the life, personality, and Gospels of our Lord. As it would be impossible in the course of this article to notice their various conceptions of Jesus, I shall confine myself to a short notice of the principal theories of Jesus of which Baur, Strauss, Renan, and Harnack are the representatives.

It is not wise to imagine that Baur's tendency-hypothesis has been wholly exploded. Modern writers are reproducing his arguments. Baur's explanation of the genesis of Christianity is of a piece with his reading of history. Men who lived and wrought are but the embodiments of "the idea," or the mouthpiece of the "tendency." Human and historical characters are bereft of their individuality; they vanish into smoke; they do not act, or think, or speak; the idea or the tendency incarnate for the time in their bodies attends to such matters. Christianity has been the result of a development from a conflict between two of these tendencies—the