

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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE II.

IS THE SO-CALLED "PRIESTLY CODE"
POST-EXILIC?BY THE REVEREND J. J. LIAS, M.A.,
HAYWARD'S HEATH, ENGLAND.

No one who is conversant with modern biblical criticism can have failed to notice the extreme unwillingness of the critic of the hour to meet the arguments of his opponents, and the somewhat suspicious eagerness with which he assures the world that the whole controversy is closed. As a matter of fact it has scarcely been opened. Owing to a concurrence of unfavorable circumstances, the critics of the critics have had no proper chance of being heard, especially on the English side of the Atlantic. And for the following reasons: (1) The secularization of the two ancient universities of this country, which took place fifty years ago, has not yielded its natural fruits until now. The tradition which required the theological professors at these Universities to hold a brief for the Theology of the Church of England has only just passed away, and a period when the professors are not only permitted but expected to be altogether unfettered in their researches has definitely arrived. Consequently, and very naturally, the public opinion of the University is at present running very strongly in favor of absolute freedom of research. Then (2) these Universities are in the swing of a very strong reaction against over-dogmatism; and (3) it will hardly be denied by people of reflecting minds that the age is in a most unusual hurry to arrive at conclusions; that these conclusions are very fre-

quently not the result of progress in the past but the direct negative of all former beliefs; and that the time spent in testing alleged results is looked upon as time wasted. Consequently — and especially is this the case in the critical investigation of the Scriptures — the latest theory which holds the field is trumpeted as "scientific," "assured," "indisputable," and its results as "final." "Scholars," we are somewhat pompously informed, "are agreed" on the conclusions arrived at by the latest methods in fashion. The legitimate inference is naturally drawn from the postulate that those who dispute the conclusions in question are "*not* scholars." And the practical result is that all criticism is silenced in the organs of opinion which claim to be conducted on principles of scholarly research. It is true that this summary mode of silencing antagonists bears a suspicious similarity to the methods of the Vatican in days past, and that it is precisely the same as that which the Curia is now employing towards Tyrrell and Loisy. It may therefore be found useful to remind the public that calling names is not argument; that even "bigots," "obscurantists," and "traditionalists" may have something to say for themselves; that the conclusions to which men, of necessity, must bind themselves who undertake the office of a teacher in a Christian church are not altogether out of date, and that men of mark in various lines of theological inquiry (such as Professors Döllinger, Herzog, Flint, James Robertson, and Orr) have expressed their opinion that the modern biblical critic cannot claim to have established his position, until he has met and mastered all the objections which his researches have encountered.

It is needless, at this time of day, to state the theory of the genesis of Hebrew history, and of Hebrew institutions, with which the name of Wellhausen is identified. And it will

hardly be denied, even by the most admiring of his disciples, that from the very beginning it has rested not on argument, but on assertion. As Mrs. Eddy's doctrine of Christian Science is based on the assumption that there is no such thing as matter; so the whole theory of Wellhausen rests on the denial of the supernatural. This is perhaps a rather large assumption. It can be fairly made only after historical investigation has disposed of the claims of Judaism and Christianity to a supernatural origin. But as previously to Wellhausen's time a number of similar systems depending on the same denial have had their day and have ceased to be, it is perhaps a little premature to assume that his researches will not follow those of his predecessors into the *limbo* of forgotten fancies. Their case was as ably stated as his, and defended, if with somewhat less brilliancy and audacity, yet with an unquestionably greater array of learning. Yet their theories have passed away forever.

The object of the present article is purely critical. It will assume no principles — theological, historical, or literary. It will resort to no denunciation. It will not even glance at the supernatural. It will confine itself simply to the question whether the Priestly Code (usually designated by the symbol P) betrays signs of post-exilic diction. It will first inquire whether the words and the phrases declared by the critics to be characteristic of P are post-exilic in their character. It will then proceed to examine the undisputed post-exilic authors, and to inquire whether they display characteristics which differ in any way from the Hebrew of P. It should be borne in mind that the later disciples of Wellhausen have modified their theories. Wellhausen and Robertson Smith held that Ezra had the completed Pentateuch before him. It is now contended that the "redaction" of the Pentateuch had not yet taken

place. Professor James Robertson has publicly stated his conviction that so far-reaching a change of front should have been openly avowed, instead of passing it over *sub silentio*.¹ But the modern critic is nothing if not infallible. To admit the possibility of error on his part or that of his school would he feels be fatal to his reputation. Before passing on to the promised investigation, I may be allowed to add that I owe to Mr. Wiener (to whom the readers of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* are already so much indebted) the information that Wellhausenism is declining in reputation in the land of its origin, and that this decline is owing to the growing influence of scholars named Dahse and Eerdmans. As I am verging on threescore and fifteen, the lovers of the Bible will understand that I have no time to waste in investigating the last factor in a series which leads not to infinity but to zero; and that, like the well-known German Professor Klostermann, I want to "stick to facts."

I.

I proceed to examine the phenomena presented by the words which Professor Driver selects as characteristic of P. To save my readers' time, I shall accept his statements — of fact not of theory — save where they appear to me to be open to correction. They are generally, I admit, quite accurate. The number of words believed by the Professor to be characteristic of the Priestly writer is forty-five, omitting those which are simply geographical terms. These last I need not discuss. We have heard a good deal about literary criticism. There is unquestionably a certain mannerism about every

¹ "Statements such as these I have quoted amount in my opinion to a set of critical canons quite different from those of Wellhausen, and Dr. Driver would have been no more than just to himself if he had (as König has done) accentuated the difference." (*Early Religion of Israel*, Preface, p. x.)

author — certain tricks of style which belong to him and to no one else. But I shall discuss only such words as seem to throw light on the question of date. Yet one brief remark may be permitted before entering into a more detailed investigation. I have discovered — and any one who takes the trouble to test the matter may also easily discover for himself — (1) that in *any author* it is possible, on the principles of modern Old Testament criticism, to assign his work to two persons, by carefully separating his more formal, matter-of-fact, and prosaic sentences¹ from those which are more animated and rhetorical. Moreover, (2) certain passages (notably the narrative of the institution of circumcision in Gen. xvii., and the parts of chap. xxxiv. which are assigned to P), are quite as "free, flowing, and picturesque"² as any in the rest of the narrative.³ Then, (3) many of the passages severed from the rest of the narrative and assigned to P are mere scraps, consisting of one, one and a half, or two verses at the most. I ought perhaps to add (4) that the contradictions of which so much is made by the critics do not exist in the narrative itself; but are brought into existence, simply and solely, from the severance which has been effected.

Such attempts to analyze a narrative into its component parts would be regarded as simply ridiculous in all ordinary literature. It is not very clear why it becomes "rational" and "scientific" only when the question of Revelation is involved. Scientific inquirers, moreover, in all sciences, except that of Biblical Criticism, are accustomed rigorously to test

¹ "P is stereotyped, measured, and prosaic." (Driver, Introduction, p. 122.)

² These, according to Professor Driver, are the characteristics of JE. (Intro., p. 122.)

³ The same may be said of the parts of the narrative assigned to P in Ex. i.-xiv., or Num. xvi. (note especially ver. 21, 22).

their methods by *applying them to given cases*. When a set of biblical critics have been shut up, apart from each other, separately, with a narrative before them written by two or more persons with whose style they are not familiar, and when they all independently arrive at the same result, we may trust them in their analysis of the Pentateuch. But sensible persons will reserve their opinion on this latter point till the critics have been thus tested; and have come triumphantly forth from the ordeal. We proceed to the discussion of Dr. Driver's selections.¹

No. 1. "God, not Jehovah." The use of this name for God is described as occurring "uniformly," except Gen. xvii. 1; xxi. 1b. Why these "exceptions" occur, the Professor does not deign to inform us. The ordinary reasoner would conclude that their occurrence is fatal to his theory. Neither does he explain why P should begin to use Jehovah after Ex. vi. 1. If he uses Jehovah in Gen. xvii. 1; xxi. 1b, because he desires to lay stress on the Divine Personality rather than on the Divine Nature, why should not this be the criterion of its occurrence throughout the whole Pentateuch, considered as the work of a single writer? It is a line of research at once

¹ It may be well, before going further, to remark on another peculiarity of the modern critic. When convenient he is extremely definite in his assumptions and conclusions. But on occasions he takes refuge in a judicious vagueness. Thus he is accustomed to use the word "probably" in great profusion. And when the reader has forgotten that it has been used, the "probability" becomes an ascertained fact. In like manner we are left in doubt whether P is exilic or post-exilic, apparently in order that the critic, when about to be impaled on one of the horns of a dilemma, may take refuge behind the other. This article will, in dealing with an antagonist who shifts his ground in this way, confine itself to the proof that P is not post-exilic; since we have but one author who confessedly writes in the exilic period. That writer is Ezekiel. But if there are points of contact between Ezekiel and P it is for the critic to show that P imitates Ezekiel, and not Ezekiel P.

sounder and more profitable than that followed by Wellhausen and his disciples; and it is to be hoped that it may one day be carefully worked out, and its ethical and its spiritual lessons recorded for our benefit. The fact that God did not reveal his Covenant Name to Israel till he did so to Moses at the Bush, need surely not prevent the writer from using the Covenant Name before that event, especially in passages in which the close personal relation of God to his people is intended to be strongly enforced. Lastly, as Dr. Redpath and Mr. Wiener¹ have shown, the readings of the LXX and those of the Massorettes do not always agree in the matter of the use of the Sacred Name. Is it strictly "scientific criticism" to build a theory on a doubtful reading, and not only to leave questions of reading undiscussed, but apparently not even to know that they exist?

No. 2. *Mīn*, "kind." This word occurs repeatedly in Gen. i., vi., and vii., and nine times in Lev. xi.; otherwise only in Deuteronomy, and once in Ezek. xlvii. 10. Dr. Driver's note here must exceedingly puzzle the ordinary student. On Lev. xi. 19, he adds "hence Dt. xiv. 13-18." But Leviticus is supposed by the critics to be subsequent to Deuteronomy. The evidence for *mīn* looks in the direction of the word being used technically by the writer of the Pentateuch and being obsolete after his day, though it is once quoted by a writer of later, but not post-exilic date, in which he is mystically foreshadowing a revision of the Mosaic Law.

Nos. 3 and 4. *Sheretz* (noun and verb). The noun appears in P in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, also in Ps. cv. 30; Ezek. xlvii. 9; the verb in P (Gen. and Lev.) and *seven times*

¹ All sound scholars are deeply indebted to Mr. H. M. Wiener for showing that the learned followers of Wellhausen have adopted a post-Christian Hebrew text *en bloc*, without condescending to inquire into the question of various readings.

in Deuteronomy. Here the evidence is in favor of its being an archaism found in the Pentateuch, once used in poetry, and once in a passage in the verse previous to the one in which *mîn* appears in Ezekiel. The probability clearly is, that these two verses in Ezekiel are a quotation from *one ancient* document. The use of archaisms in poetry only is a phenomenon which occurs in many languages. I might of course follow the example so frequently set by the critics and regard probability as certainty. But in the interest of really scientific research I refrain from doing so.

No. 5. *P'ru wrabu*. Found only in Genesis, in Exodus once, in Leviticus once, twice in Jeremiah (once "inverted"), and once in Ezekiel; evidence the same as in the two former cases; *no authority whatever* for the theory that P is post-exilic.

No. 6. *L'oclah*. Four times in Genesis, once in Exodus, twice in Leviticus, and several times in Ezekiel; evidence as before; *no sign whatever* of post-exilic use.

No. 7. *Tol'doth*. In the Pentateuch this word in the sense of "these are the generations of" occurs invariably at the *beginning* of the mention of the person or thing whose "generations" are recorded. On the critical theory it sometimes occurs before and sometimes after the person or thing to which it refers (see Gen. ii. 4; v. 1; vi. 9; x. 1; xi. 10, 27; xxv. 19; xxxvii. 2). In all these cases, on the critical theory, *tol'doth* stands at the *beginning* except two—the first and the last. It is obvious that this departure from usage is introduced on the critical hypothesis. On a more rational theory it always stands at the head of the passage. Thus in Gen. ii. 4 it relates to the preparation of the earth for man's inhabitation, the divine origin of all phenomena having been asserted in the previous chapter. In xxxvii. 2 it commences the history of Jacob's family. The word does not always strictly mean

"generations." As will have been evident, it refers sometimes to some special process whereby a purpose is accomplished, or a series of events worked out, and corresponds in those cases to the word "development" or "evolution," or even "history." The word, apart from the above-mentioned phrase, only occurs in P, and in First Chronicles. It is clearly a technical word, only used in reference to genealogies and important historical developments. The evidence here suggests arbitrary division on the part of the critics.

No. 8. *Meath*, "hundred" (construct state). Here older (and with submission at least equally sound) authorities tell us (though Professor Driver does not trouble himself to mention the fact) that "hundred" or thousand usually stands in the construct state *when other numbers follow*. Gen. xi. 10, and Ex. xxxviii. 27, appear to be the only exceptions. But all this is mere guesswork and hypercriticism. In English the same man will say "a hundred pound" and "a hundred pounds." And it is quite within the range of possibility that the letters ך and ך may occasionally have been substituted for one another by the copyist. It is certainly a rather contracted pedestal on which to build a theory. The post-exilic evidence for this mode of speech consists of *three* passages. Of these, one is confessed to be corrupt; a second is a Masoretic correction of the text; the third is 2 Chron. xxv. 9. As the same words occur in the previous sixth verse with the word "hundred" in the absolute state, it is pretty clear that no very conclusive "stylistic" argument can be built on the use of this word. The confession by Professor Driver that P twice has "hundred" in the absolute state is sufficient to dispose altogether of the argument on this point. Moreover, *meath* may have been the *scriptio defectiva* for *meoth*, "hundreds," which often occurs.

No. 9. *Gewagh*, "to expire." This word occurs only in P, in Josh. xxii. 20 (assigned to P), and in *later poetry*. This is obviously another case of the phenomenon mentioned under No. 3.

No. 10. "With thee (him, etc.)" after an enumeration. As this phrase appears to occur *only* in P, it becomes a question how P has been delimited, and whether the passages in which this form of words occurs are not arbitrarily severed from the context. Genesis vii. 7, in which the expression occurs, is thus treated by Dr. Driver: "Verses 6 and 7-9 (in parts)" are torn from the rest of the narrative. *What* the "parts" are we are not told. By his own confession the characteristics here are by no means clear. How does he know that they exist at all? Certainly a vague assignment of this kind is too weak a foundation to build a theory upon. The same may be said of verse 13, for the merest scraps of narrative are here boldly assigned to one author or to the other, with little reason or none at all given for doing so. Then, again, it is not contended that there are any post-exilic affinities to this expression anywhere.

No. 11. "And Noah did (so); according to, etc." Here again there are no post-exilic affinities. This and the former phrase are obviously archaisms. They have, it must be admitted, more force than most of Dr. Driver's selections as evidences of variety of style. They might be idiomatic phrases of a particular author. But, on the other hand, they are entirely without signs of the late date he attributes to them. And when one does not know that the supposed post-exilic author is not a pure figment of the brain, the facts are hardly strong enough to bear the theory.

No. 12. "This selfsame day." Here the phrase occurs not only in P, but in Deut. xxxii. 48 and in Josh. iv. 11. So far as

this goes, it suggests joint authorship for P and Deuteronomy. Joshua iv. 10-12 is somewhat arbitrarily separated by the critics from the rest of the narrative. And here again post-exilic *criteria* are lacking. Once more the phenomena point to an early date, and apply as much to Deuteronomy as to the other portions of the Pentateuch. Joshua, it is admitted on all hands, belongs to the same period as the completed Pentateuch. The expression may therefore, as critics of old have believed, be characteristic of the *earlier* Hebrew. Dr. Driver's criticism of Josh. x. 27 (where the expression occurs once more), "not P, probably the compiler," deserves a passing notice. It is, as has already been hinted, a peculiar characteristic of the modern biblical critic to imagine that when he has let drop the mystic word "probably," which he does very frequently, he has proved his case. He then assumes his guess to be solid fact, and to argue on it as such. How far this is a characteristic of "scientific" criticism, let genuine men of science tell us.

No. 13. "After their families." This expression occurs very frequently in P. But it also appears once in JE. That of course is a matter of no consequence, though, had it suited the critics, it would not "probably," but certainly, have shown that it was a word of the earlier Hebrew. The passages Josh. xvi. 8 and xvii. 1a (1b-2) seem to have been assigned to P simply *because these words are found in them*. This is a common practice of the critic, and is of course a fine example of the *petitio principii*. For Josh. xvi. 1-3, 9, 10, and xvii. 5 (6)—the brackets are not explained—8, 9b, and 10b-18 are assigned to JE, and 9a, 9c and 10a are assigned to P. Thus verse 9 is divided into three parts, of which two are assigned to one writer, and the third to another—another instance of "scientific criticism." No reason whatever for the division is given. The critic does it because it suits him. What more

can the "candid inquirer" want? Are not the "stylistic criteria" obvious? The words "after their families" occur in the passages assigned by a certain school of critics to P. Therefore P, and no one but P, wrote them, and there is an end. There are, however, "*no stylistic criteria*" whatever, save of course the expression in question, which can justify the slicing up of the passage Josh. xvii. 8-10 by the critics, and its preposterous assignment to two or even *three* authors in the way just described. The word (it is practically one word in Hebrew) is simply the technical word in *all genealogies*, and it occurs once in First Samuel and once in Chronicles.

It is a needless task to drag my readers through Dr. Driver's elaborate assignment of particular words to P. Numbers 15, 16, 18-20, 23, 26, 28-35, 37-40, 44, display precisely the same set of phenomena as those which have already been examined. That is to say, there are no signs of affinity with the Hebrew of the post-exilic period, and no occurrences of any of the words in any books but in Joshua, Chronicles, and Ezekiel. Thus the linguistic phenomena in *all* these instances are as consistent with the traditional theory that the Pentateuch was the work if not of one hand yet of one period, and that the earliest in Israelite annals, as they are with the theory which has found favor with Dr. Driver. Of course I make no assumption that the writer (or writers) of the Pentateuch used no documents in his account of what took place. But (1) the endeavor to discover the exact nature and limits of these documents by mere subjective criticism must necessarily be a very uncertain task, and (2) the critics have supplied us with no satisfactory proofs that *their* analysis is more trustworthy than that of their predecessors, whose work, careful and elaborate as it was, is now completely discredited. The reader can go through Dr. Driver's references at his leisure,

and will easily see that I have not been guilty of misrepresentation. Any person who has the most elementary acquaintance with methods properly called "scientific" will see at a glance that Dr. Driver's methods have no pretension to be regarded as such.

They are full of the *ignoratio elenchi*, the *petitio principii*, and of almost every other fault known to logicians. It is true that he makes some better attempts at reasoning in the portion of his treatise given to a discussion of the general features of the supposed "prophetical" and "priestly" writers. Yet those portions of his "Introduction" appear to me to be little more satisfactory or conclusive than the rest. With them, however, I am not at present dealing. I am dealing with the elementary facts on which he supposes himself to have demonstrated the existence of such writers, and the characteristics found in each. Unless these conclusively prove the existence of such writers, they have no existence whatever. I proceed to discuss the phrases which rest on a somewhat different foundation to those which I have at present considered. I should add, however, that I have not gone into the occurrence of words in Chronicles, because the writer says he has followed pre-exilic sources. Dr. Driver, while he characteristically declares that the Chronicler is deceiving his readers, nevertheless maintains that the Hebrews slavishly copied, and did not re-write, their authorities.¹

1. One of these is (No. 18) *racash* (verb) and (No. 17) *r'cush* (noun), the first translated "gotten" or "gathered," and the second "substance," "goods," or "riches." These are a pair of words which, as they occur not unfrequently in undisputed post-exilic writers, in Chronicles, Ezra, Daniel,

¹ I have examined this theory of Dr. Driver in my paper in *Lex. Mosalca*.

might have suggested a post-exilic origin for the passages in which they appear. But alas! they serve only to demonstrate the utter weakness of Dr. Driver's case. For while they occur only *eleven* times in P, they also occur in Gen. xv. 14 (assigned by Dr. Driver to E), and repeatedly in chapter xiv., assigned with the most unhesitating confidence to a "special source," altogether distinct from all the other sources (though on this point Dr. Driver is singularly reticent; see Intro., pp. 13, 14). This chapter was at one time pronounced to be absolutely unhistorical, altogether improbable in itself, destitute of foundation, and (by the earlier critics of the destructive order at least) altogether irreconcilable with what is known of the history of the time. As it has been most strongly corroborated in almost every detail by recent archæological discovery, and as it is pretty nearly certain (though of course the "scientific critic" vehemently denies this) that three or four of the names of kings mentioned in it occur on the monuments, and one of them, Amraphel, is not improbably to be identified with the famous Khammurabi, it is probably well that the "scientific critic" should "lie low" on this point. Anyhow it is demonstrated that chapter xiv., with its extraordinarily correct information of the condition of the East in the days of Abraham, is not post-exilic. But the troubles of the "scientific critic" unfortunately do not end here. *R'cush* is written in the *scriptio defectiva* when it occurs in P, save once in Numbers, and four times in Genesis, but only in the suffix third person plural. It appears in the *scriptio plena* when it occurs in Chronicles, Ezra, and Daniel. Too much stress, of course, may be laid on this fact, because it may be attributed to the copyists. But when so many pyramids of criticism are standing on their apices, a fact of this kind should certainly not be passed over without notice.

2. Two other words which signify "property" are also attributed to P. They are *achuzzah* and *kanin*. Since the critics are wont, very frequently indeed, to assign an unusual word to a different hand, it would seem a little unreasonable to credit P with so wide a vocabulary. It is true that there is a slight difference in meaning in the words. *R'cush* means "that which one has collected" or "gathered"; *achuzzah*, "that which is laid hold of" or "seized"; and *kanin*, "that which has been obtained by purchase" or, as in the case of Cain, "by birth." The latter seems to indicate less violence or exertion in the process of acquisition than the other two. In regard to *achuzzah* (No. 22), it is found in P frequently; once in Deuteronomy (some two centuries before P we are asked to believe); in Joshua once in a passage assigned, arbitrarily of course, to D² (whosoever that writer may be — we have, it is not well to forget, no evidence whatever that he existed). The rest are assigned to P. Elsewhere it is found several times in Ezekiel, twice in the Psalms, and once in Job. The cognate verb (No. 23) occurs twice in the Pentateuch, and twice in Joshua. In each case it is assigned to P. Here, again, there is absolutely no evidence that the word is post-exilic. *Kanin* (No. 27) occurs five times in P (one of these in Josh.), twice in the Psalms, and once in Proverbs; no post-exilic evidence to confirm this. The use in the Psalms is doubtless a poetic archaism. A cognate noun, *Micneh* (No. 24), occurs eleven times in the Pentateuch, and four times in Jer. xxii.; again, no post-exilic evidence.

3. Then we have the expression "to be gathered to" or "to be cut off from one's peoples" (or people). This occurs in Deuteronomy, once in Ezekiel, "perhaps" in Judges and in Hosea; never in a post-exilic author.

4. *Shephatim* (No. 29) occurs sometimes for the more

usual *mishpat* in P, in Ezekiel several times, once in Proverbs, and once in Second Chronicles. It may have been a survival in Second Chronicles. But if post-exilic it would not have been found in Ezekiel or Proverbs.

5. The word *gulgolah*, "skull" (No. 36), appears occasionally in P, and twice in a chapter of First Chronicles; always in genealogies, evidence of which is insufficient.

6. *According to the Mouth of Jehovah* (No. 41), not a very common expression in P. "Very uncommon elsewhere," says Dr. Driver. But he adds, that it occurs in Deuteronomy xxxiv. 5b, "probably from P." His treatment of this chapter is most unsatisfactory. On page 67 he assigns verses 1b-7 "in the main" to the author of Deuteronomy. On page 127, as we have seen, he thinks it is taken "probably from P." On page 150 he returns to his former analysis. The reader will not fail to note the word "probably." If the expression in Deuteronomy xxxiv. 5 be only "probably" from P, then no valid argument has been adduced for the assertion that it does not appear in the work of the Deuteronomist. Then the words "in the main" on page 67 are added in a footnote. This looks very much as if the passage on page 127 was an afterthought, and the footnote added on page 67 to cover it. Genuine critics will feel that this mode of treatment of a subject of some importance is decidedly inadequate.

7. *Machatzith* (No. 42). This is once more an unsatisfactory note. First, the fact that the more usual *ch'tzi* is also found in P is not stated. Then, in Neh. viii. 3 the word does not mean "half," as elsewhere, but "middle." It occurs there in the expression "mid-day." Otherwise there would have been a post-exilic use of the word, corresponding to that of P. The word occurs *twice* in First Chronicles, but only in the *genealogies*, to which no special date, obviously, can be as-

signed. There is no *sign*, therefore, here of post-exilic origin for P.

8. *Maghal* (No. 43). This, we are told, is "a word belonging to the priestly terminology." But the Priestly Code, we have been told, did not come into existence till after the exile. Yet this word, though belonging to its "terminology," appears, as Dr. Driver admits, in Deuteronomy and in Ezekiel. Thus it is neither "priestly" nor post-exilic. Dr. Driver here fails entirely to see the bearing on the question of the fact that the word is found in Dan. ix. 7. If *he* fails to perceive it *we* may also be excused for doing so.

9. Of "the methodical form of *subscription* and *supercription*" we are told (No. 44) that it is "not a complete enumeration." Therefore it is needless to consider it.

10. Next follows a medley of words and phrases (No. 45) with which I need not detain the reader long. If *matteh* be the usual word for "tribe" in P, yet if *shebet* is used also by that writer, it is obvious that the use of one or the other word is no conclusive characteristic of his style. If P uses *holed* for "beget," and JE *yalad*, by whom is *hiwaled* (Gen. iv. 18; x. 1; xvii. 17; xlvi. 20) used? Once more, either the use of a different form is or is not a sign of a different writer. Again, we are told that *chazak* is used by P, and *chabad* by JE, for "to harden" (the heart). But inasmuch as it is an easy task, first to fix on particular words as characteristic of a certain writer, and then to sever a single verse, or, as we have seen, even a *third* of a verse, from the rest of a passage, and assign it to that writer, the assertion must be set aside as worthless, unless some further proof is given of it.

Dr. Driver's selection of words has now been passed in review. It has been shown that in none of them, save the words

racush and *r'cush*, is there the slightest sign of correspondence between P's style and that of the post-exilic period; but actually the contrary. In every other case Dr. Driver's own linguistic researches are evidence, not for, but against, his conclusion.

A few words, however, may be added to show how very flimsy is all the parade of research with which the Hebrew student of to-day is so easily daunted. Perhaps Gen. xxxiv. supplies us with one of the most remarkable evidences of the weakness of the critical case. First and foremost, it contains the great discovery with which Dr. Driver's name will henceforth be exclusively associated, namely, the famous one of the "two sources" from which the story of Dinah is obviously derived. They are obvious, he tells us, because in one verse Shechem is represented as wishing to secure Dinah for himself, while in another Hamor is described as only anxious for the advantages of the alliance. (Introd., p. 15.) It might be supposed by ordinary persons that the normal bridegroom generally *does* wish to possess the lady, and that as a rule it would be found extremely inconvenient if her prospective father-in-law wished to possess her also. But "modern scientific criticism" has exploded so absurd an idea. It has set up new, and "scientific," canons of evidence for general use on a matter of very common experience. Henceforth, if any one remarks of a marriage, "He is so fond of her," and "The family are pleased because it is such a good match," persons of a "scientific" order of mind will gravely point out that their statement is unhistorical, because of the evident divergence of the sources from which it has been obtained.¹ Then, again, if any one will put the narratives of JE and P in Genesis xxxiv. in

¹This important discovery is incorporated with Dr. Driver's Commentary on Genesis, and will be found *in loco*. Another equally

parallel columns, it will be found that P is quite as lively and picturesque as JE, and perhaps even a little more so. And the arbitrary nature of the principles of criticism by which the above-mentioned great discovery is backed up comes out rather more clearly in this chapter than elsewhere. Thus some critics of the Wellhausen School assign the words "to see the daughters of the land" (ver. 1) to JE. Professor Driver assigns the whole verse, and the first part of the second verse, to P. Could anything be more arbitrary? It will not be pretended that the words "to see the daughters of the land" display any more definite "stylistic criteria" in Hebrew than in English. Nor does there seem any particular reason why the nominative in verse 2, "Shechem the son of Hamor the Hivite," should have been taken by that very remarkable personage the Redactor from one of his authorities, and the verbs "saw her" and "lay with her" and "humbled her" from another!¹

Then, again, the words "saw her," in the Hebrew, precede "Shechem the son of Hamor the Hivite"; so that, according to Dr. Driver's division, the words "saw her" are taken from JE in the midst of a passage belonging to P. This is singular enough in itself. But the singularity is not exhausted. As Dr. Driver maintains that the Hebrew editor is a mere slavish copyist, we must understand that the editor in the midst of his transcription of a passage from P suddenly casts aside his MS.

ingenious discovery in Introduction (p. 8) has been somewhat reluctantly abandoned in the Commentary; though to ordinary persons it has appeared that Rebekah would never have been so foolish as to have alarmed her sick husband by telling him that Esau was plotting Jacob's death, and that she might have been expected to assign a different reason for recommending Jacob's immediate departure.

¹ Kautzsch and Socin here declare the words "lay with her" to be a "gloss"! Why, it would puzzle a conjurer to conceive, save that the whole narrative would be unintelligible without it. But then what clumsy narrators JE and P must have been!

and inserts two words from JE. Surely some explanation of this remarkable conduct on his part is required. We are told, it is true, that P and JE contradict one another frequently; though, as the contradiction does not appear in the Pentateuch as it stands, it must have been most skillfully reconciled by the redactor. But are we to suppose that, in P's narrative, the dishonorable action attributed to Shechem is described as having been committed without his having seen Dinah? Truly the supernatural is avoided by this treatment of the authorities. But if it disappears, it is only to be re-introduced in another form. Anything more preternatural than the personality of the authors and the redactor, as represented by the modern critic, cannot possibly be conceived.¹ If anything in the least degree like it can be found in the criticism of any profane author in any age or in any language, I will pledge myself to lay down my pen on this subject and never resume it. To any critic of Gen. xxxiv. who approached the subject without any fixed prepossessions of any kind, the chapter will appear to suggest a document of considerable antiquity handed down by the compiler of Genesis rather than the extraordinary aspect with which its critics favor us here. First of all, in verse 4 we have a word used for "young woman" which occurs only three times in the Old Testament. It means literally "female offspring." Then another somewhat unusual word, *naghar*, (on which I shall have something to say presently,) occurs in verse 3 and is ascribed in the first half of the verse to JE and

¹The late Professor Green of Princeton has made some caustic remarks on this point in his *Unity of the Book of Genesis*, and I have frequently touched on it, though in entire independency of Dr. Green, in my papers in the *London Churchman*. No one can have the least idea of the absurdities involved in criticism of this kind, unless he has gone through it chapter by chapter and verse by verse.

in the second half to P.¹ We have so many assertions that this or that word is "characteristic" of this or that author, that we might have expected some characterization of the same kind here. But the appetite for distinctions altogether fails the critic when it is not convenient to indulge it.² Then the Hithpahal of the verb *ghatsab* occurs only twice in the whole Bible in the sense of "grieve," and each of these is in Genesis. But the critics assign it in one passage to JE and in the other (ver. 7) to P. The expression "folly in Israel" which occurs here is far more likely to have been taken by later writers from the Mosaic books than to have been adopted by the writer of the "8th or 9th Century B.C." from Judges or Samuel. Then in verse 8 there is a rare word signifying "loving desire," which appears once here (P), three times in Deuteronomy, and only three times besides in the Old Testament. How eagerly would the critics, had it suited them, have pointed out the sign of unity of an authorship between Deuteronomy and P! The verb *sahar*, "to trade," occurs four times in the Bible, three of which are in the book of Genesis, and two in this chapter. This at least suggests that the word is one of early date. The same may be said of *mahar*, "to endow," and its kindred substantive "dowry." The word and its derivative occur only five times in the Old Testament,³ the noun once here, when it is assigned to JE, the verb three times in the so-called "Book of the Covenant," i.e. Ex. xx.-xxiii., which is admitted on all hands to be of very early date, and the

¹ So Kautzsch and Socin, but Dr. Driver steers clear of this rock.

² Dr. Driver admits, as well as he may, that it is a little difficult to effect the analysis here. Professor Green has remarked (and I have made the same remark in my Churchman papers) that every critic of this chapter has an analysis of his own.

³ The word occurs frequently in another sense—"to hasten." But there is no connection between the one meaning and the other.

noun again in 1 Sam. xviii. 25, after which it drops out of use. The evidence, therefore, — though of course not decisive if standing alone, — looks in the direction of the materials of this chapter *as a whole* being of very early date. And, in combination with other evidence which has been given above, that position is indefinitely strengthened. At least it is strong enough to outweigh statements which, as any one may see who studies Wellhausen or any of his disciples, depend almost entirely on assertion. The verb *oth* or *uth*, once more, occurs three times in this chapter in the sense of "consent." In that sense it only occurs again in the Old Testament in 2 Kings xii. 9. But our critics assign it once to JE and twice to P in the chapter to which we are referring. Can we fail to see in the use of so peculiar a word one more sign of *the common authorship* and *early date* of this chapter? The expression "broad of hands" (ver. 21), lastly, in the sense of "spacious," though occurring in the later Hebrew, has a flavor of antiquity about it, and this is confirmed by its appearance in this — one might almost say — undoubtedly early chapter.

But this is not all the evidence. I promised to return to the word *naghar*. It has been seen that, *though an unusual word*, the critics have assigned it to JE and to P indiscriminately. But its peculiarity consists in the fact that in the Pentateuch, and *in it alone*, the word *neghar* is applied to youth of *both sexes*. In later Hebrew the feminine form *n'gharah* is used of young women. This phenomenon occurs four times in Gen. xxiv., twice in this chapter, and *once in Deuteronomy*,¹ and *nowhere else* in the Old Testament.

Of course the well-known fact that there is no feminine pronoun corresponding to *he* in the Pentateuch, can *not* be ig-

¹ It is characteristic of the modern biblical critic that Wellhausen in his *Composition des Hexateuch und der Historischen Bücher des*

nored in the way in which it is the custom of the critics to ignore it. There is no attempt to answer the argument for the early date of the Pentateuch derived from this fact. It is simply waved aside. But surely it is extremely remarkable that this phenomenon, with one or two exceptions, is observed *throughout the whole Pentateuch, and nowhere else*. It is rendered the more remarkable from the fact that the Hebrew *hu*, "he," differs from *hi*, "she," only by the length of its stroke. Throughout the whole Hebrew Bible the reader is admonished to substitute u for i or i for u according as this stroke has been made too short or too long. The fact, therefore, that the form *hi* occurs only once or twice in the whole Pentateuch is a fact which no fair-minded investigator could fail to take very serious account of. The entire absence from P of the abbreviated *sh* for the earlier *asher*, "which," is another very significant sign of the earlier date of P. The frequency of its appearance in the post-exilic authors and in the later Psalms strikes every student of the Hebrew language.¹ There is another kindred fact, the *scriptio plena and defectiva*, of which notice will also be taken by the genuine seeker after truth. This has been mentioned in reference to *r'cush*. It also occurs in reference to the spelling of Jericho: When that city is mentioned in the Pentateuch, it is spelled without the second *Jod* (*scriptio defectiva*). Throughout Joshua it is spelled with A. T. cites the Pentateuch as if it read *n'gharah* and not *naghar*. Every tyro knows that the Massoretic corrections beneath the text are simply *directions to the reader*. The critic, when it suits him, is capable of displaying a sublime indifference to facts.

¹ It occurs sometimes in Judges, but nowhere else till post-exilic times. There seems no probable explanation of this fact except that in Judges it is a provincialism which eventually forced its way into general literary Hebrew. Deborah's song, in which this abbreviation first appears, is certainly not *late* Hebrew. Beside Deborah's song, the short form occurs only in the history of Gideon the Manassite.

the *Jod* (*scriptio plena*). In Second Samuel the older spelling is returned to, as in Jeremiah and in Chronicles. In 1 Kings xvi. 34 a still fuller spelling is adopted, that with an *h* final; while 2 Kings ii. 4 returns to the spelling of Joshua. As the books of Samuel and Kings are obviously compilations from fuller documents, the differences in spelling are natural enough.

But the variations between the Pentateuch and the later writers on the one hand, and the intermediate writers on the other, are surely significant. With the exception of 1 Kings xvi. 34 (of which no explanation seems to have been given) the evidence is in favor of the traditional view of the relative date of the books. In the days of Moses the shortened spelling is used. In the days of the Judges, when Joshua was compiled, the longer form had come into vogue. The writer of Second Samuel (naturally a conservative, and therefore deeply attached to and acquainted with the ancient literature of his nation, since by that time the Pentateuch had circulated more widely as a document) adopts the earlier spelling. The writer of the stories of Elijah and of Elisha, whom the critics, and this time not without excellent reasons, conjecture to have been a Northern Israelite, follows the accepted spelling of his day, and not that of the Pentateuch, with which he might perhaps be less familiarly acquainted. After his time, with the single exception above noted, the scribes attached to the House of Judah accept the traditional spelling.¹ I do not desire to overestimate the cogency of this reasoning. I do not suppose

¹The critical mode of dealing with Numbers and Joshua is characteristic, and cleverly evades the difficulty. Numbers xx:-xxii. 1, 2, are attributed to P and JE by Dr. Driver. Chapters xxii. 2-xxiv. are said to belong to JE; so does Josh. ii. Joshua vii. 1 belongs to P, though verse 2 does not. Joshua xxiv. 11 is divided between E and D². But Num. xxxiii. 48 and xxxv. 1 are assigned to P. And Deuteronomy also has the Pentateuchal spelling of Jericho, as well as does the supplementary chapter at the end.

it to be one of the necessary links in a chain, but rather as a mesh in a web, in which, if any part of the mesh should fail, the rest of the fabric will hold. At least what has been said is fully as worthy of attention as are the wild and random assertions on which the critical fabric depends.

The array of words and expressions supposed by the critical school, which professes to have finally settled the date and mode of the composition of the Pentateuch, to be characteristic of the post-exilic "Priestly writer," have now been carefully examined; and it has been shown not only that not a trace of post-exilic diction can be proved to exist in it, but that the evidence derivable from these characteristic phrases (with one or two exceptions which have been duly noted) proves conclusively that the diction of P is *not* post-exilic. Neither Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, nor Daniel shows the slightest sign of approximation to it. The case of Chronicles, as has been already stated, is one with which it is difficult to deal; because we have not been able accurately to ascertain the date at which each passage in Chronicles was written. There are no similarities of expression between P and Chronicles, moreover, which cannot be explained on the theory of the chronicler being familiar with the contents of P.

The so-called "Second Isaiah" displays no special points of contact with P, though it is now supposed to have been of exilic origin. Neither do any of the various authors of the "First Isaiah," which recent criticism has called into being, display any "stylistic" correspondences with P, though several of them are supposed to have been written during the exile. Ezekiel and (occasionally) Jeremiah are the only late writers who display unmistakable affinity with P. And it is perfectly obvious that this fact is as well, perhaps better, ex-

plained on the theory of the Mosaic, as on that of the post-exilic, origin of P.

An analysis of the linguistic features of one single chapter of Genesis has been subjoined for the purpose of showing (1) the utterly arbitrary character of the analysis resorted to by the critics in support of their foregone conclusions; and (2) the way in which genuine criticism tends to support a conclusion exactly the opposite of theirs, and to confirm the traditional belief that the documents with which we are dealing are of a remote antiquity. It remains now only to invert the methods of inquiry, and to show that the post-exilic writers are full of words and expressions which *are not found in P, but which could hardly be absent from its pages if it had been composed in post-exilic times.*

One important feature of the investigation has been designedly omitted, because it has already been carried out by a competent scholar, who has shown that a careful comparison of the Pentateuch with the rest of the Old Testament Scriptures reveals precisely the same features as are discovered when comparing the Authorized Version of the Bible with English literature of a late date.¹ The cogency of the demonstration will doubtless appear in a different light to minds differently constituted. But every candid person will admit that such a line of investigation is not only legitimate in itself, but demands, as a factor in the problem, due and careful study. The "scientific" critic, however, thinks otherwise, and passes by such investigation, however ably conducted, and however fruitful of at least apparent results, with scornful indifference. How far such an attitude is truly scientific, and

¹The investigation will be found in an able book, by the Rev. F. E. Spencer, called "Did Moses Write the Pentateuch after all?" London: Elliot Stock. 1901. Pp. 291. (See pp. 219 ff., 2d Ed.)

how far it is compatible with the proper treatment of a subject which "penetrates" (or should penetrate) "to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow," I will leave to the judgment of the reader.