THE

CHURCHMAN

MARCH, 1902.

ART. I.—FURTHER NOTES ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

OUR task in dealing with P draws rapidly to a conclusion. The extracts from it supposed to be embodied in the remainder of Genesis are few and are not often important. P's narrative, as separated by Kautzsch and Socin, proceeds as follows from Gen. xxxvii. 1 to xlvi. 34:[1] "And Jacob dwelt in the land of his father's sojournings, in the land of Canaan. These are the generations of Jacob. And Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh King of Egypt. And they took their cattle, and their goods, which they had gotten in the land of Canaan, and came into Egypt, Jacob and all his seed with him; his sons, and his sons' sons with him, his daughters and his sons' daughters, and all his seed brought he with him into Egypt." Kautzsch and Socin, however, differ rather seriously from Professor Driver here. They only assign chaps. xxxvii. 1, xli. 46, and xlvi. 6, 7, to P.[2]

Our next point is that once again, as the most cursory glance at P's narrative, given above, will suffice to show, considerable and important omissions are found in that narrative here. It speaks of Joseph as in Egypt, but we are not told how he got there. It says that "they"—who "they" are we are not told—"took their cattle and their goods, which they had gotten in Canaan, and came into the land of Egypt." *Why* they came, P does not tell us. Yet surely he must have explained the reason in some way, unless his narrative was the most extraordinary collection of scraps ever dignified with the name of history. The only rational conclusion is that

[1] It will be seen that it is not particularly intelligible.

[2] The Rainbow Bible does not altogether agree with either. I have pointed out in my article in the January number that an infinitesimal difference in the assignment may have infinite effects on the results.

once more P's narrative does not stand before us *in extenso*, although criticism affects to have discovered that it does so. Then we are left to conjecture whether P corroborates or contradicts JE here, and, if he contradicts him, why the redactor follows JE in preference to P. There would be no occasion to assign this passage at all to P, but for the phrase רכוש אשר רכשו, which has been asserted to be a characteristic of his style. Once more, therefore, the facts are derived from the theory; the theory is not built upon the facts. Then, again, in the genealogy which follows we have not the word הוליד, which has been alleged to be a characteristic of P, but instead of it we have "the sons of," a form of expression which, so far as it goes, tends to support Kautzsch and Socin's theory that here we have the words of the redactor, not those of P. Once more, too, we have several times the expressions "she bare" (as in vers. 15, 18, 25) and "were born" (vers. 22, 27). The first expression is found repeatedly in the genealogy in chap. xxxvi., assigned by Kautzsch and Socin to the redactor. On critical principles, as accepted by the German school, Kautzsch and Socin are undoubtedly right. "She bare," on those principles, is obviously characteristic of some one who is neither JE nor P. But, then, to whom is the expression "was born," found in vers. 22, 27, to be assigned? The most delicate and elegant development of the new criticism would naturally find another hand here—neither JE nor P, nor the redactor, but the same hand which we find at work in Gen. iv. 18—not the whole passage, vers. 16-24, which Kautzsch and Socin have clumsily assigned to J (!), but just this one particular verse. We may, therefore, fairly ask, Are the critical methods sound, or are they not? If sound, why are they only employed where it suits the critic, and cast aside when he finds them inconvenient? If not, can we build any satisfactory conclusions whatever upon them?[1]

The next point to which I would ask attention is the peculiar and accurate use of the word "Hebrew" in the narrative in Genesis. It means those who have come over from some other land—Chaldæa, for instance—and it is used simply and solely when the Hebrew race were spoken of by outsiders. It is not confined to P. It occurs first, when the fugitive from Sodom came to tell Abram of his nephew's captivity, in Gen. xiv. 13. Joseph is spoken of as an Hebrew by Potiphar's wife, chap. xxx. 9, 14, 17; Joseph speaks to Pharaoh of the "land of the Hebrews," chap. xl. 15. He is once more spoken of as "a young man, an Hebrew," chap. xli. 12. In chap. xliii.

[1] See my last article in the CHURCHMAN, January, 1902.

32 the word is used in a way which corresponds with the utmost subtlety to the thought of the writer when describing the Egyptian view of the Israelite foreigner. The same phenomenon occurs in Exod. i. 15, 16, 19; ii. 6, 7; iii. 18; v. 3; vii. 16; ix. 11, 13; x. 3; and again in 1 Sam. xiii., xiv., where the word is either put in the mouth of the Philistines, or is used where there is a subtle indication of the thoughts of the Philistine host.[1] The only places where the word occurs elsewhere are Deut. xv. 12, and Jer. xxxiv. 14, where the passage in Deuteronomy is quoted. The phrase is to be found in JE and in the supposed author of Gen. xiv. In Deuteronomy it would seem that the same idea of distinction between the Israelite and the foreigner was in the writer's mind. Now, if the narrative had not been drawn up from contemporary records, but was an attempt to record the ancient history of the race in the eighth and ninth century B.C., it would have been impossible that this most strikingly characteristic expression should have been used. The mode of describing foreign sojourners and slaves natural in the mouth of an Egyptian would not have occurred to the Israelite writer some ten centuries later than the events recorded, some five centuries, at least, later than the Exodus. The writer would have used the word "Israelite" as a matter of course, unless we are to postulate a manner of writing which has only lately been brought to perfection in a writer who lived some 2,500 years ago.

Our investigation, though mainly, is not exclusively confined to P. I may therefore note the fact that the moral principles assumed in the narrative of chap. xxxviii. are almost precisely those of the Jewish law. So far, then, from the Jewish institutions having gradually developed until some time after the return of the Jews from Babylon, this chapter represents them as having been handed down from patriarchal times. The institution of "raising up seed unto a dead brother" is regarded as coeval with the sons of Jacob. The punishment of the harlot is even more severe than that denounced in Lev. xxi. 9. And if we are forbidden to draw any inferences as to the early customs of the Hebrews from a writer of the eighth or ninth century B.C., we are at least permitted to note the fact that his narrative presupposes the existence of such laws and moral principles. In the eighth or ninth century B.C., therefore, and probably much earlier, the custom of raising up seed to a deceased brother was in existence, and among the Jews in Palestine, in marked contrast to their Phœnician neighbours, harlotry was already regarded as

[1] Compare Gen. xliii. 32.

an abominable crime. The moral and legal code, then, of the Hebrews, as far back, possibly, as the tenth or eleventh century B.C., already differed *toto cœlo* from that of their Canaanitish neighbours, from which, we are told, it was gradually evolved, and the account of it here handed down falls in admirably with the historical details of the Book of Joshua. Another touch of Nature meets us in Judah's vehement condemnation in the case of his daughter-in-law of what he permitted in himself. No writer composing or compiling a history to support a preconceived system of doctrine and morals would have allowed such conduct on the part of a patriarch to appear in his narrative. Far less, if possible, can he be supposed to have invented it. The shortcomings of the patriarchs, as here related, are therefore evidences of the transparent truth of the narrator.

It has often been argued that the minute acquaintance with the manners and customs of the Egyptians displayed in Genesis and Exodus proves incontestably that these books were written by one well acquainted with Egypt—I will refer my readers to Rawlinson's researches and those of Tomkins in support of this point—but I may remark that Gen. xli. 8 (JE) and Exod. vii. 11, 22 (P) verbally agree on the fact that the Egyptian kings were accustomed to surround themselves with "magicians" and "wise men." Both writers, if indeed there be really two writers, speak of the חרטמים and the חכמים. As the one writer is not supposed to be copying the other here, we derive from this fact a very strong evidence for the contention that the writer of Gen. xli. and of Exod. vii. is one and the same, and that he was a man who, by reason of his long residence in Egypt, was familiar with Egyptian life in all its details.

Once more, the description of Joseph as one in whom the Spirit of God is, though it occurs in JE, corresponds in language and idea with P's description of Bezaleel in Exod. xxxi. 3 and xxxv. 31. Another indication this of common authorship. It will be observed, and it strengthens the argument, that the words do *not* occur in a very similar passage in 1 Kings vii. 14. The phrase "to require blood," again, occurs in chap. ix. 5 (P) and in chap. xlii. 22 (JE). It does not occur elsewhere, save in Ezek. xxxiii. 6. The most probable inference here is that the phrase belongs originally to the early author of the Pentateuch, and that Ezekiel, the influence of the Pentateuch on whose mind is indisputable, borrows it from him. Then we have סחר with an accusative in chap. xxxiv. 10 (P) and in xlii. 34 (JE) in the sense to traffic or trade in a land.[1]

[1] Without an accusative, the word only occurs in Gen. xxxiv. 21, and once in Jeremiah.

This word is very probably, therefore, characteristic of the author of the Pentateuch. Again, in chap. xlv. 2 (JE) and in Numb. xiv. 1 (P) we have to "give forth the voice in weeping," another phrase peculiar to the Pentateuch.

Another indication of the authenticity of the history is to be found in the trait of Jacob's character manifested in chaps. xxxii. 13, and xliii. 11—namely, his habit, when in a position of danger, of endeavouring to propitiate his real or supposed adversary by a present. It is true that both these passages are assigned to JE, but they lead the inquirer with a mind free from preconceived ideas to the conviction that here we have not legend, but real history. These striking signs of individuality point, not to legendary invention, but to a real and definite historical character.

When we analyse chap. xlvi. 8-27, we find (1) that it follows the narrative of JE, and sometimes quotes it verbally, and (2) that it has additional information. Whence was that information derived by the redactor?—for we must bear in mind that, according to Kautzsch and Socin, though not according to Professor Driver, the redactor is the author of these verses. If, as Wellhausen thinks, the materials were taken by the redactor from P, then P had JE before him, for the account of Jacob's children agrees with the latter to the minutest detail. But if P had JE before him, then all his alleged departures from JE are deliberate. We need, therefore, before the question of authorship is settled, an exhaustive inquiry into these alleged deliberate contradictions of JE by P, their cause, and the authorities followed, if any. Be it noted, moreover, that where the redactor here quotes chap. xli. 50 verbally, Kautzsch and Socin assign that passage also to the redactor. There is no reason whatever for such assignment, no breach of continuity in the narrative, and there are no traces of interpolation. Thus the assignment once more seems to be the result rather of the necessities of the theorist than of the invincible logic of facts.[1]

The next extract from P (or the redactor) after the genealogical tables in chap. xlvi. commences oddly enough (ver. 56) with the word "saying." For an explanation of who is "saying" this we must turn to the other narrative, or what is supposed to be such. The redactor has given us (out of J, according to Kautzsch and Socin) a description of the meeting of Jacob and Joseph, and of the subsequent interview between

[1] Wellhausen says ("Die Composition," etc., p. 53): "The material certainly of this detailed catalogue (vers. 8-27) of the seventy souls is taken from Q [P], but it appears to be by a later hand." But chap. xlvi. 6-8 are "unquestionably P's." This is the usual "proof."

Joseph and Pharaoh. This is brought down to the words, "And Pharaoh spake unto Joseph." An ordinary mortal would have gone on to copy from the authority he was following what Pharaoh said. But, as we have often been reminded before, the redactor is *not* an ordinary mortal. So he breaks off from one of his MSS., seizes on the other, and tells us from *that* what Pharaoh said. One naturally would like to know why he did this. It is not, on the face of it, a very intelligible course. But, as usual, our only guidance is the maxim "Faith believes, nor questions how." "Scholars are agreed," and so the redactor takes his narrative from one source and the speeches from another. Not even that, however, for he returns to JE in the middle of ver. 6. Truly, the redactor must have been an extraordinary person.[1] Then, again, as the extract from P begins with the word "saying," P must have contained a parallel narrative of Joseph's interview with Pharaoh, and, therefore, presumably of Jacob's descent into Egypt. Once more, then, P is not before us *in extenso*, nor have we the slightest clue to the grounds of the redactor's selections from his authorities here, nor of his strange propensity—according to the critics—for involving himself in the most unnecessary and absurd contradictions. That P must have contained a narrative of Jacob's journey is clear from the words, "Thy father and thy brethren have come down unto thee." Why was it left out? Another strange thing, and one of which it appears reasonable that some explanation should be given, is that the extract from P, which begins most amazingly in the middle of ver. 5, should end as amazingly in the middle of ver. 6, and that the redactor, after copying from P the words, "in the best of the land make thy father and thy brethren to dwell," should suddenly fling aside P, go back to JE, and copy from it the words, "in the land of Goshen let them dwell; and if thou knowest any able men among them, then make them rulers over my cattle," after which P is once more allowed to take up his parable, and continue it till the end of ver. 11. Then a verse is taken from E, after which J is allowed to go on in peace till he is mingled, like the feet of Daniel's image, with P in the transcription of ver. 27.

There is absolutely no reason for this. No argument is adduced to support it. There are no signs of want of continuity in the story, no signs of incoherence or want of coherence in the style. It flows on as evenly and naturally as possible. There seems no reason whatever why the redactor should abandon one authority and betake himself

[1] See below.

to another; why the redactor should make J (or JE) tell us that "Pharaoh spake to Joseph," and not allow JE to tell us what he said; why JE, and JE only, should be allowed to mention the land of Goshen. Nor are we told how JE managed to obtain such a minute acquaintance with Egyptian customs as enabled him to say that "every shepherd is an abomination to the Egyptians." We may conclude our study of chap. xlvii. with the remainder of P in that chapter. It will be placed in brackets: "And Israel dwelt [in the land of Egypt] in the land of Goshen [and they gat them possessions therein, and were fruitful, and multiplied exceedingly; and Jacob lived in the land of Egypt seventeen years: so the days of Jacob, the years of his life, were an hundred forty and seven years]." The words "in the land of Egypt" hung, to use Wellhausen's felicitous simile, "like a man suspended by his own waistband." We don't exactly know, again, who "they" are who "gat them possessions therein." And as we have been frequently reminded in these papers before, so again here the canons adopted by the German critics are *not* those of "ordinary historical and literary investigation," but canons invented *pro re natâ*—canons accepted in Scripture investigation alone. Of course, "gat them possessions," and "were fruitful and multiplied," are expressions regarded by the critics as characteristic of P. But here, once more, there is no real trace of dislocation, either of style or narrative; nothing, therefore, to show that the critic has not arbitrarily fixed, with the aid of a Hebrew concordance of the Old Testament, on certain expressions as characteristic of the authors he has chosen to invent.

One trifling point occurs to me on re-reading Gen. xlvii. Criticism has sharply noted that JE speaks of the Israelites as settling in the land of Goshen, while P locates them in the land of Rameses. Two remarks seem necessary here. The first is that the redactor could hardly have failed to note such a contradiction within six verses, and to have corrected it, more especially if we are to find such frequent traces of his hand as Kautzsch and Socin suppose. The second is that in P Pharaoh is said to "have commanded" that Israel should settle in the land of Rameses—that is to say, he not only ordered that the Israelites should be located in the "best of the land," but he specified where that land was. He does precisely the same in ver. 6. He not only commands that the Israelites should be "made to dwell in the best of the land," but once more he states where it is. Criticism, however, assigns the first half of ver. 6 to P, and the second to JE, because instead of the "land of Rameses" we have there "the land of Goshen." Is not the evidence decisive here on two

points—(1) that the two verses are by the same pen, and (2) that the land of Goshen *was* the land of Rameses ?[1]

J. J. LIAS.

ART. II.—THE CEREMONY OF CONFIRMATION, AND THE LINK BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

THE earlier comments upon the Confirmation of Dr. Gore, and the proceedings which arose out of it, showed that the majority of English Church-people, including a large proportion of those who write in the press (religious as well as secular) knew very little about the history of the ceremony and its constitutional significance. Most people seem to have thought that it has always been a ceremony which in some way protected the rights of the Church as against the State, and was, therefore, a very precious relic, which ought to be preserved in all its reality. That is a view which was advanced in the Hampden case, but could not then be established.

Let it be remembered that the Popes long fought for the right of being the person to confirm the election of a Prelate. When the Pope got that power into his own hands, was it a triumph for the English Church or a victory for a foreign potentate? As a matter of fact, it was the victory of a foreign potentate over the English Crown and the English Church. When, at the Reformation, Henry VIII. recovered for himself the power which the Pope had held, was that a victory for the English Church or for the English Crown? There is a sense in which it was a victory for the Church, but in a more definite way it was a victory for the Crown. The relation between Church and State then returned to that which it had been the steadfast aim of the Papacy to overthrow.[2] By

[1] Hommel, "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," p. 230, note, takes this view. So also Sayce, "Higher Criticism and the Monuments," pp. 227, 239. Wellhausen separates between the "best of the land" and "the land of Goshen," because Pharaoh would have acted foolishly in giving them the best of the land if they only wanted pasture for their cattle!

[2] The circumstances are thus stated in the judgment of the Lord Chief Justice: "From about the year 1316 down to the passing of the statute in 1533, a period of over two hundred years, an entirely different state of things seems to have prevailed. At one time the Popes were insisting upon the right not only to confirm, but to select; at another the Crown was resisting the Papal claims. Sometimes the struggle would appear to have been between the Pope on the one side and the Metropolitan or the electing corporation, be it dean and chapter, or abbot and convent, on the other. Confirmations at times took place at Rome, at times in England under Bulls from the Pope, and during the last fifty years immediately preceding the statute some authorities state that the King